Cambridge Bible

for

Schools and Colleges

DUKE
UNIVERSITY

DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE

LONDON
Cambridge University Press
FETTER LANE

NEW YORK · TORONTO
BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
Macmillan

TOKYO
Maruzen Company Ltd

All rights reserved

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE

EDITED BY

H. K. LUCE, B.D.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
HEADMASTER OF DURHAM SCHOOL

WITH
INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1936

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY W. LEWIS, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE

Div. S.
220.7
C178C
v.40

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
I. The Study of the Gospels	vii
1. Textual Criticism	viii
2. Source-Criticism	x
3. Form-Criticism	xiii
II. The Third Gospel	xvi
1. Authorship	xvi
2. Date	xviii
3. Sources	xix
Matter peculiar to Luke	xxiii
Bibliography	xxiv
TEXT AND NOTES	1
APPENDICES	
I. Jesus and His People	259
II. The Writer of the Gospel	268
INDEX	271

288716

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

INTRODUCTION

Section I

THE STUDY OF THE GOSPELS

Until about two centuries ago the independence and historical accuracy of the four Gospels was generally assumed. They were regarded as separate yet equally authoritative units in the inspired record of the establishment of Christianity, preserved by the Christian Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The only task of criticism during this period was to expound. Accuracy of text and fact alike were taken for granted.

At the end of the eighteenth century, however, when deeper investigation into the history of the Church was being undertaken, the origin of the Christian documents themselves naturally came under review. The simple attitude of Irenaeus (second century), who regards the existence of four Gospels as a fact on the same level as the existence of the four winds or four points of the compass, gave place to a desire to probe into those earliest days of the Church, when, so it appeared, the Gospels had not yet been officially accepted. The Gospels had existed before the Church's approval made them sacrosanct. They might therefore be critically examined, without the presuppositions of independence and accuracy. The logical conclusion of this change in the attitude of Christians towards their sacred books was that they should treat them as they would treat any other historical documents of antiquity. But it was a conclusion which was not reached without much doubt and opposition.

Gospel criticism has followed three main lines of study, each of which overlaps into the others: textual criticism, i.e. the endeavour to arrive at the exact words written by the author of the document; source-criticism, i.e. the study of the relations between the documents themselves, and their relation to any other documents their authors may have used; and form-criticism, i.e. the attempt to investigate the period before any documents were in existence, and to study the oral 'forms' in which, for a considerable period, the Christian tradition must have been handed down. This line

288716

of study, which has naturally followed upon the results of the other two, and is comparatively recent, is the most fruitful at the present day. The results of documentary criticism are to a great degree assured, the materials at our disposal have yielded considerable progress towards the true text of the Gospels, but it is only since the beginning of the present century that the far-reaching influence of primitive Church life and thought upon the raw material of the Gospels has been realised: and in a field of study where the mists are so thick and the paths hard to trace progress must needs be slow and doubtful.

1. *Textual Criticism.* There are well over 2000 MSS of the N.T. in Greek, designated by letters or numbers. All but about 40 of these date from the ninth century or later and are what are called 'cursives,' written in connected script. The earliest MSS, dating from the fourth to the ninth centuries, are called 'uncials,' i.e. written in capital letters, separately. Besides Greek MSS there is a large number of Latin MSS, some as old as the fourth century, the majority much later. There are two fourth–fifth-century MSS of the Old Syriac Version; and MSS also of the Aethiopic, Armenian, Egyptian and Gothic Versions, of varying date.

With such ample material at his disposal it might be thought that the textual critic's task in arriving at the true text should not prove difficult. In textual criticism, however, mere number means very little indeed. What counts is antiquity and freedom from the influence of corrupt texts. Thus the vast majority (over 2000) of the Greek MSS, the earliest of them an eighth-century MS, present practically the same text. In point of fact this text, although its representatives are so overwhelmingly numerous, is not nearly so valuable, i.e. close to the original, as some other texts represented by a few, or, it may be, a single MS.

The English Authorised Version was translated in the sixteenth century from the Greek text of a certain French printer named Stephanus, which became known as the Textus Receptus or 'Received Text.' This text was itself a revision of a somewhat earlier text produced by Erasmus. Both Erasmus and Stephanus used only late MSS representing what is known as the Byzantine text, that is to say the text standardised in the Byzantine Empire throughout the Middle Ages. These MSS were members of the huge group referred to above, and owe their origin to a revision

Matt. ix. 4 f.

4. And Jesus knowing their
thoughts
said,
Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?
5. For whether is easier, to say,
Thy sins are forgiven;
or to say, Arise,
and walk? 6. But that ye may know
that the Son of man hath power
on earth to forgive sins (then saith he
to the sick of the palsy),
Arise, and take up thy bed,
and go unto thy house.

Mark ii. 8 f.

8. And straightway Jesus, perceiving
in his spirit that they so reasoned
within themselves, saith unto them,
Why reason ye these things in your hearts?
9. Whether is easier, to say to the sick
of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven;
or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed,
and walk? 10. But that ye may know
that the Son of man hath power
on earth to forgive sins (he saith
to the sick of the palsy), 11. I say
unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed,
and go unto thy house.

Luke v. 22 f.

22. But Jesus perceiving
their reasonings,
answered and said unto them,
What reason ye in your hearts?
23. Whether is easier, to say,
Thy sins are forgiven thee;
or to say, Arise
and walk? 24. But that ye may know
that the Son of man hath power
on earth to forgive sins (he said
unto him that was palsied), I say
unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch,
and go unto thy house.

made by Lucian of Antioch about A.D. 310. The English Authorised Version, that is to say, was translated from a text to which, practically speaking, none of the most important MSS and versions, which have since become available, had contributed, except, so to speak, by accident at an earlier stage. The English Revised Version was made in 1881 from a text largely based on the famous revision made by Westcott and Hort.

2. *Source-Criticism.* The first three Gospels—those of Matthew, Mark and Luke, according to the traditional authorship—are usually spoken of as the 'Synoptic' Gospels. The name means 'seen at a glance,' and is derived from the fact that at the end of the eighteenth century scholars began to produce editions of the Gospels in which the portions of each Gospel, or of any two of them, which referred to the same events, were printed in parallel columns on the same page, so that they could be seen and studied together. When these parallel portions of the Gospels were studied, it soon became apparent that some literary connection must be assumed to explain their similarities. Not only are these similarities too extensive, but their agreement is too close, for the coincidences of oral tradition to be an adequate explanation. Thus, Mark contains 661 verses. Matthew reproduces, in substance, over 600 of these, and uses actually 51 per cent. of Mark's own words. Luke reproduces over 500 verses of Mark—not all the same as those reproduced by Matthew—and uses 53 per cent. of his actual words. Practically all Mark, that is to say, is reproduced in Matthew or Luke, or both; and slightly more than half of Mark's actual words reappear. Apart from this general coincidence in substance and language there are many passages—such as that on the previous page—which shew the necessity of assuming literary connection. It is scarcely possible to maintain that independent oral tradition would in each case have reproduced the peculiarly broken construction of the last verse.

[In passing, this passage will serve to illustrate some features of the normal treatment of Mark by Matthew and Luke. Thus:

Matthew and Luke are both somewhat shorter than Mark. They abbreviate by omitting what is not essential, e.g. 'in his spirit' in verse 8 of Mark, and 'to the sick of the palsy' in verse 9; Matthew also omits 'unto them' in 8 and 'I say unto thee' in 11. They substitute more compact phrases for Mark's somewhat

primitive language, e.g. in the first half of 8 and the second half of 9. ('And straightway' in 8 is a characteristic phrase of Mark, which he uses as a connective more frequently than any other. This means that he has very few subordinate clauses, and gives his style its plain and rather monotonous rhythm. Matthew and Luke avoid the phrase.) What they substitute is intended not only to shorten Mark but to improve his style.]

In the early days of criticism it was sometimes maintained that Mark is the latest of the three, and is an abbreviation of Matthew or Luke or both. It will not, however, take much study of the three Gospels together to convince the student that if this were so the author of Mark must be regarded as scarcely sane. In passages common to all the Gospels Mark's account is almost always longer than Matthew's and Luke's. To leave out the story of Jesus' birth and infancy, nearly all His teaching, and practically all the parables, in order to tell what remained at somewhat greater length, would be a ludicrous proceeding. It is easy, however, to understand that Matthew and Luke, who had much new matter to tell, were compelled to abbreviate Mark in order to keep within the limits of the papyrus roll. In a multitude of details, moreover, the reason for alteration of Mark by Matthew or Luke is clear, whereas the contrary proceeding would be inexplicable. The view that Mark is the earlier, and formed the foundation of Matthew and Luke, is not now seriously challenged.

What Matthew has reproduced from Mark forms only about half of his Gospel; in Luke's case the proportion is rather less. When those portions of Matthew and Luke which are *not* derived from Mark are examined, it is found that something over 200 verses of them are similar, not only in substance but in wording. The conclusion is now well established that Matthew and Luke both used another document besides Mark. This document has not itself survived, and it is obviously impossible to be quite certain of its contents, for some of the similar passages in the non-Marcan parts of Matthew and Luke may have come from oral sources and, on the other hand, some passages which are not common to both may have been taken from this document by one of the evangelists and omitted by the other—as is sometimes the case in their treatment of Mark. These passages cannot now be identified. It is clear, however, that in the main this document

was a collection of Jesus' teaching, prefaced by an account of John the Baptist, Jesus' Baptism and Temptation, and the Healing of the Centurion's Servant. It may have been translated from an Aramaic original. It is usually known as 'Q,' from the German 'Quelle,' 'source.'

It has sometimes been held that the agreement of Matthew and Luke in non-Marcan passages may be explained by the view that Matthew knew Luke's book or *vice versa*. That this is not the case is clear from two facts at least: (1) that in practically every case Matthew and Luke differ in the point in the Marcan foundation at which they place a common non-Marcan saying. Thus, if one was using the other's work, he must have taken the trouble, for some quite inexplicable reason, to alter every context, however appropriate; (2) 'Sometimes it is Matthew, sometimes it is Luke, who gives a saying in what is clearly the more original form. This is explicable if both are drawing from the same source, each making slight modifications of his own; it is not so if either is dependent on the other' (Streeter, p. 183).

A different version of about a quarter of what can be assigned to Q occurs also in different contexts in Mark. It has therefore been held that Mark knew and used Q. There is little doubt that Q was earlier than Mark, for a collection of Jesus' sayings would be needed early in the Church's life, partly in order to prevent inaccuracy in their transmission, partly to supplement the instruction of those who were already familiar with the facts of Jesus' life. A brief outline of fact, such as Mark's Gospel is, would not be required until Christianity was carried further afield. It is thus possible, though not perhaps probable, that the writer of Mark used Q, or a somewhat different version of it.

About a fifth of his Gospel is peculiar to Matthew, i.e. not drawn from Mark or Q. The amount of peculiar matter in Luke is greater, between a quarter and a third of the Gospel. Something more will be said of Luke's peculiar matter in the next section.

[See Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, Chapter VII; *Peake's Commentary*, art. 'The Synoptic Problem'; Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, Chapters 1–3; Burkitt, *Gospel History and Its Transmission*, Chapters 1–4, or *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*.]

3. *Form-Criticism.* Our earliest Gospel, that of Mark, was certainly not written before A.D. 60. Q is earlier, how much earlier is quite uncertain. Paul's earliest epistle cannot have been written before A.D. 45, and is perhaps later. There is no reason to believe that any of the other written sources used by the Synoptists is as early as Q. It is clear, therefore, that for a considerable period, between the death of Jesus and the composition of written documents, the teaching of Jesus and the events of His life existed only in oral tradition—in the reminiscence and preaching, that is to say, of the early Christian Church. During this period the tradition crystallised, through constant oral repetition, into certain habitual kinds of story, or 'forms.' Form-criticism is the study of these preliterary forms, and the attempt to determine their relation to the life of the community which produced them: to discover, that is to say, how the forms took their shape, and to estimate the effect of the moulding process upon the primitive tradition (if any) which provided the material to be moulded.

Form-criticism is a very recent development of Gospel study. It began to emerge in the commentaries of more radical critics soon after the turn of the century, and in 1919 a German scholar, Dr M. Dibelius, published *The Form-History of the Gospels* (English translation *From Tradition to Gospel* published by Nicholson and Watson in 1934). Since then the most important publications have been Bultmann's *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921), followed by his *Jesus* (1926); *The Story of Jesus' Passion and the Cult of Christ*, by Bertram (1922), and, incidentally, Loisy's commentary on Luke (1924). The very radical conclusions of these writers were to a considerable degree adopted by Dr Montefiore in the second edition of his *Synoptic Gospels* (1927). *The Poetry of our Lord* (C. F. Burney, 1925) and *The Original Jerusalem Gospel* (J. M. C. Crum, 1927) use similar methods to achieve much more conservative results. *The Form-Historical Method* by E. Fascher (1924) is a criticism of Dibelius, Bertram and Bultmann. For English readers the best short introduction to the subject is *The Gospel before the Gospels*, by B. S. Easton (Allen and Unwin, 1928), or the first half of H. J. Cadbury's *Making of Luke-Acts* (Macmillan, 1927). See also R. H. Lightfoot's *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1934).

Form-criticism studies first the motives which operated in the

transmission of the Gospel material. The preface to Luke's Gospel states its author's motive as the desire to enable converts to 'know the certainty with regard to the matters in which they had been instructed' (Luke i. 4). The primary motive, therefore, is the furtherance of early Christian mission preaching and the confirmation of converts' faith. This operates in many different ways. In all history there is an automatic selective process which depends upon the inherent interest of what is to be told. What is uninteresting is forgotten. The force of this is all the greater when the aim is to interest the hitherto indifferent. Interesting things are told in the most interesting way possible. Unessential details are dropped, the central interest of the story is underlined by various devices. The persistence of detail in Mark, dropped by Luke and Matthew, will be remembered in this connection, as also the frequent emphasis of interest by descriptions of the surprise and wonder of spectators, or their failure to understand. Striking events are made more striking, diseases cured more serious, the cures themselves more instantaneous,—all storms are bad storms, all escapes narrow escapes. The same influences surround the tales of a hero's career. Miracle becomes his natural environment, he is not as other men are, his birth and death in particular are unique. These influences are not in any way peculiar to the Christian tradition. They occur universally in the primitive traditions of all races. Cadbury describes them as 'due indeed to a universal psychological law, but it is the simple law of interest and the natural ways of its expression.'

There are other, specifically Christian and religious, motives. The fulfilment of O.T. prophecy; the fulfilment by after events of prophecy uttered by Jesus Himself; the desire to shew that behind the Christian movement in its earliest days was always at hand the active power of God, to further its efforts and blast its enemies; the problem of the relation of Christianity to Judaism on the one hand and the Gentiles on the other, and the desire to find support in the tradition for this or that attitude of the present time; Christological motives—assertion of Jesus' Messiahship, evidence for His Divinity in the supernatural or mysterious; ecclesiastical motives—the experiences of the early apostolic age read back into the stories of even earlier days, the simplicity of their preaching, the persecution patiently endured, the earnest

looking forward to the Day of the Lord, the desire to justify Church organisation and practice; all these play their part in the moulding process.

The forms themselves, into which the material has been shaped by this process, have been variously defined. Dibelius, for instance, distinguished the following, among others: sermon units, which he called 'paradigms,' i.e. short pieces of tradition, for preachers' use, containing a saying of Jesus possessing universal application, which is the kernel of the paradigm, no unnecessary detail, and a closing formula shewing the effect of what is told; 'stories,' mainly about miracles, vivid in detail, sometimes coming themselves from non-Christian sources, sometimes embellished with more detail from outside; 'sayings,' collected in very early days to form a 'parenesis' or moral code, some of them direct from Jesus, others drawn from Jewish or Greek sources or supplemented by Christian 'prophets' to suit the needs of particular situations; 'legends,'—the word means simply 'what is to be read,' i.e. in Church services—an enlarged paradigm or story where other characters besides Jesus play a part; 'epiphanies,' in which a supernatural being is manifested to a few chosen witnesses; 'myths,' tales to explain some Christian doctrine or custom, or transferred to Jesus from pagan sources, thus merging into the folk-tale. Bultmann analyses the material even more minutely, especially the sayings, of which he regards the great majority as coming from the Church rather than from Jesus. He distinguishes five classes of sayings: 'logia' or proverbs, many of them from the O.T. or elsewhere; apocalyptic sayings, most of them produced or adapted by Christian literature and hopes; ecclesiastical precepts; sayings in the first person, most of them Messianic apologetic; and parables. He calls Dibelius' paradigms 'apothegms'—'pithy sayings or significant acts, enclosed in an historical setting.' Fascher criticises such classifications as too complicated and uncertain, and proposes a simpler division into dialogues, sayings and miracles. This is adopted by Easton, in the book mentioned above, and is made the foundation of an interesting and useful examination of much of the Gospel material.

Whether form-criticism in itself is entitled to express judgements with regard to the historical value of the various elements in the Christian tradition is a disputed point. Dibelius held that the

different forms were produced by successive stages in Christian development, and thus date themselves: 'the tradition about Jesus began with parenesis... with the Gentile mission the paradigm was developed,' and so on. This seems too simple to be true, and does not allow for the coexistence, at various times and places, of different needs and motives as factors in moulding the tradition. Easton declares that 'form-criticism as an historical tool has a very limited utility.' Its function is merely to prepare the way for historical criticism.

The non-specialist will probably be more inclined to agree with the latter estimate than with the former. The world in which form-criticism has to move is at present so shadowy that detailed classifications and dogmatic judgements of provenance seem highly subjective and artificial. Of the form-critics' paradigms and apothegms and all the rest those who themselves passed on the Christian tradition were blissfully unconscious. Yet it would be foolish to underrate the importance, for historical criticism, of the form-critic's work. It is still true that the historicity of each section can only be estimated by individual examination, and cannot be settled once and for all by reference to a particular form. Yet the historical critic has, or should have, learnt much from the form-critic. He has learnt, perhaps, that what the Gospels tell us is more precarious than he thought when he laid down the solution of the Synoptic problem. It is an overstatement, yet not an extreme one, that 'the burden of proof is always on the student who wishes to treat as authentic any saying or act' of Jesus. The influences of the moulding time of oral tradition must never be left out of account. Much that has passed unquestioned as primary may, in this new light, be seen as secondary, born rather of Christian aims and experience than in the mind or ministry of Jesus.

Section II

THE THIRD GOSPEL

1. *Authorship.* Study of the Gospel itself will tell us more of its author than any other method of approach. And 'it is far more important to know the personality of the author than his name, to know his purpose in writing than his profession, to know the

technique of his age than his exact year, to know his position in the transmission of history than his habitat' (Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 353). There is always something unreal in the emphasis laid upon arguments for or against a particular authorship, especially when such knowledge is not preceded by thorough study of the work itself. Yet it is perhaps inevitable that the question of authorship should be shortly dealt with here.

It may be assumed that the Gospel of Luke and the Acts are by the same author. Both are addressed to Theophilus in their opening words, the second speaks of the first ('the former treatise'), and their general style and language are undoubtedly the product of one pen.

The 'external evidence'—statements, that is to say, by other writers—presents the unanimous opinion, from the second half of the second century onwards, that the two books are by Luke 'the beloved physician,' who was a companion of Paul in his imprisonment (Colossians iv. 14), and is referred to in the pathetic words of 2 Timothy iv. 11, 'Only Luke is with me.' It is not generally wise to place much trust in ecclesiastical tradition, however early. The temper of early Christian devotion was not critical, and in such a matter the wish was inevitably father to the thought. Yet here the case is different. The books had little to gain by being ascribed to Luke. It is easy to see why tradition should have ascribed the first and fourth gospels to Matthew and John, to gain the full weight of apostolic authority. Luke was not an apostle; he was not a prominent figure in the N.T., nor even, so far as we know, in the early Christian world. There is no reason why the tradition that the two books were by him should have arisen, unless it was true.

The 'internal evidence'—evidence, that is to say, afforded by the books themselves—may be summarised as follows:

(1) At certain places in Acts (xvi. 10–17: xx. 5–xxi. 18: xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16), the third person plural in the story of Paul's career changes, suddenly and without explanation, into the first person plural. These 'travel diary' passages are usually taken to show that the author of Acts himself joined or left Paul at these points. Both in style and vocabulary these passages are similar to the rest of the Third Gospel and Acts: if the author of Acts had

rewritten the passages himself, it is exceedingly improbable that he would have left the first person unaltered.

(2) Is the historical accuracy of Acts such that it may be regarded as the work of one who, as the 'we' passages shew, was in close contact with Paul for long periods at a time? Those who answer this question in the negative usually do so on the ground that in general Acts fails to agree closely enough with Paul's teaching and outlook as we learn them from his Epistles; and that, in particular, the account in Acts xv of the Council at Jerusalem and its decree is incompatible with Galatians.

It must be remembered that the author of Acts does not claim to have been present at the Council; and, moreover, that his acquaintance with Paul need not necessarily have been intimate until almost the end of Paul's active career, when he was arrested at Jerusalem. Luke may have been converted to Christianity many years before, and developed his own theology. In any case Acts was not written until many years after the events which it records. Taken together, these considerations suggest that in detail of fact the book would not be likely to agree entirely with contemporary documents such as Paul's Epistles: nor would its theology be likely to coincide with that of Paul, even though its author became Paul's intimate friend at a later stage.

(3) Hobart (*Medical Language of St Luke*, 1882) concluded that the language of both Luke and Acts was throughout characteristic of a medical author. Greater knowledge of the Greek of his day, however, has proved that this conclusion cannot be maintained (H. J. Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke*). Almost all the words which Hobart held to be characteristically medical can be found in non-medical writers as well. The most that can be said is that if, on other grounds, the author is held to be Luke the physician, there are some words and phrases in the two books which confirm the tradition.

2. *Date.* xxi. 20 shews fairly conclusively that the Gospel must have been written after A.D. 70. For the Marcan 'When you see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not...' Luke substitutes 'When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies....' Later in the same chapter, and at some other points (xix. 27, 41–44, xxiii. 27 f.) there appear to be references to the siege and its consequences. 'The author and his readers seem to look back

reflectively upon the fall of Jerusalem from a certain distance' (Creed).

If the earlier limit of date is fixed at about A.D. 80, it is hardly possible to say anything more definite than that the Gospel was written between that date and the end of the century. It was apparently known to the author of the Fourth Gospel. Some have argued that the statement of the Gospel about 'Lysanias of Abilene' (iii. 1) and that of the Acts about Theudas (v. 36), in both of which Luke is held to be mistaken, can be traced to a misreading of the historian Josephus' *Antiquities* which were published about A.D. 93 (cp. *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. 'Lysanias and Theudas': Burkitt, *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 105 f.). The inference is, however, doubtful: and in some other passages Luke seems independent of Josephus. [In the case of Lysanias Creed (Additional Note p. 307 f.) argues that there is no mistake to explain, and that a second Lysanias ruled at Abila at the time stated by Luke (cp. iii. 1, note).]

3. *Sources.* To express the matter algebraically, Luke = Mark + Q + x. As we have seen, that is to say, Luke used Mark and Q, and presents also a large amount of matter peculiar to himself—between a quarter and a third, in all, of his Gospel. The question will arise here: what written sources, if any, did Luke draw upon for this material? We are not now concerned with the *oral* background of the Gospel tradition, which has been spoken of in Section I. 3. First, however, something should be said of Luke's use of Mark and Q.

Luke has used most of Mark. From time to time he leaves out a piece of Mark because he has another version of the same events from a different source; or finds it distasteful; or thinks it, for brevity's sake, unimportant. At one point, however, he omits a longer passage, Mark vi. 45–viii. 26. It has been argued that Luke's edition of Mark did not contain this passage: it seems more likely, however, that Luke deliberately omitted it, section by section, for a combination of the motives suggested above. Consideration of this will be found in the note at ix. 18.

Luke revises his Marcan material very freely. He makes drastic alterations to its language and phrasing, often practically rewriting it. Mark's style is bald and jerky, and his language sometimes slangy. Luke makes the narrative smooth and more polished,

and substitutes correct terms for words of which he disapproves. Luke shares with Matthew the tendency, through motives of reverence, to omit or soften whatever ascribes violent emotion to Jesus, or emphasises His humanity. He omits some passages, also, as discreditable to the Apostles. He constantly abbreviates Mark, both by rewriting, and by omitting unnecessary or merely picturesque detail.

Luke's use of Q is different from Matthew's. Luke groups his Q material in large blocks, which he introduces into the Marcan foundation at intervals. Matthew moulds what he takes from Q with material from other sources to form a single narrative. As we do not possess Q, it is hard to do more than guess whether Matthew's or Luke's version of any particular Q saying more closely reproduces the source. On general grounds sometimes the one, sometimes the other, looks more original.

Something must be said here of Streeter's theory of Proto-Luke —which will be found fully stated in *The Four Gospels* (1924), Chapter VIII, and has been further worked out in Taylor's *Behind the Third Gospel* (1926). It has met with considerable support, but cannot be regarded yet as established, e.g. Creed, in the latest commentary on Luke, dissents from it. If it is accepted, it will be seen that part of what has been said in the preceding paragraphs with regard to Luke's use of Mark and Q will need revision.

Briefly, the theory is that before it came into the third evangelist's hands, Q had been combined with most of what is peculiar to the Third Gospel to form one document, an earlier 'gospel,' which Streeter named 'Proto-Luke.' This is Luke's primary source, and Mark his secondary: into the main outline of Proto-Luke the third evangelist inserts extracts from Mark. Streeter suggests that Luke himself, earlier in his life, was the author of Proto-Luke. He collected material himself while he was in Paul's company at Caesarea for the whole or part of the two years during which Paul was confined there (Acts xxiv. 25). 'Later on, probably not till after the death of Paul, a copy of Q came his way, and on the basis of this and his own notes he composed Proto-Luke as a Gospel for the use of the Church in the place where he was then living. Still later a copy of Mark came his way, and he then produced the second and enlarged edition of his Gospel that has come down to us' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 219).

Of facts adduced in support of the theory the following are perhaps the most important:

(1) In the Third Gospel the material is arranged, broadly speaking, in alternate stripes of Marcan and non-Marcan matter. The main Marcan sections are Luke iv. 31–44, v. 12–vi. 11, viii. 4–ix. 50, xviii. 15–43 (xix. 29–36, xix. 45–end, which are both single stories), xx. 1–xxi. 11, and xxii. 1–13. Apart from this the Marcan material consists of fragments scattered in various contexts, the identification of which as Marcan is in many cases doubtful. Thus the beginning and end of the Gospel are non-Marcan. Moreover the non-Marcan material is twice as long as the Marcan.

(2) Where Mark and Q or L (Luke's peculiar matter) overlap, containing different versions of the same incidents or sayings, Luke frequently rejects Mark in favour of the other version. Examples of this are the Beelzebub Controversy and the Mustard Seed (Mark iii. 22 f., Luke xi. 14–23; Mark iv. 30 f., Luke xiii. 18–19; from Q): the Rejection at Nazareth and the Anointing (Mark vi. 1 f., Luke iv. 16–30; Mark xiv. 3 f., Luke vii. 36 f.; from L): the Great Commandment (Mark xii. 28 f., Luke x. 25–28; from either). Luke omits Mark's account of these incidents, but gives what comes before and after in Mark *in its original order*. The alternative versions are given in a *quite different context*. This proceeding 'is quite explicable if the version substituted stood along with the other matter with which Luke connects it in a written document which Luke on the whole preferred to Mark' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 21).

Moreover, in several instances the version which Luke substitutes for that of Mark is less interesting in itself than Mark's. 'It would look, then, as if Luke's preference is for the non-Marcan source as a whole, not merely for particular items in it on account of their intrinsic merit' (p. 210).

(3) It is generally agreed that the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel are, in their final shape, the work of the author of the Gospel himself. The first two verses of Chapter iii are an elaborate date: 'Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John

the son of Zacharias in the wilderness.' Streeter maintains that this reads as if it was originally written as the beginning of a book. 'The impression is strengthened by the curious position of the genealogy of our Lord (iii. 23). If this had been inserted by the last editor of the Gospel, we should have expected to find it, like the genealogy in Matthew, somewhere in chapters i or ii in connection with the account of the Birth and Infancy. If, however, it was originally inserted in a book which only began with Luke iii. 1, its position is explained; for it occurs immediately after the *first* mention of the name Jesus' (p. 209).

(4) 'The hypothesis that Proto-Luke was Luke's main source explains why Luke omits so much more of the contents of Mark's Gospel than Matthew does; in particular...it would account for the so-called "great omission" (Mark vi. 45–viii. 26)....To Luke Mark was a supplementary source, from which, if pressed for space, he would refrain from extracting material which seemed to him of subordinate interest' (p. 214).

Taylor's book, *Behind the Third Gospel*, examines in great detail the Marcan and non-Marcan material in Luke, and supports the theory for a variety of reasons besides the foregoing. He maintains that it explains many phenomena within the Third Gospel itself; and is in harmony with what we know of Luke's literary methods and in particular with his use of the 'We-sections' in Acts. Creed dissents from it 'primarily because, whereas Mark appears to give a clue to the disposition of "Proto-Luke" in the existing Gospel, the subtraction of Marcan material leaves an amorphous collection of narrative and discourse, the greater part of which is thrown without intelligible reason into the unsuitable form of a "travel document"' (Introd. p. lviii n.). He allows, however, that 'Q and some of Luke's peculiar material may have been already combined, and may have lain before Luke as a single document.' The present writer's opinion is that although Taylor not infrequently appears to overstate the case in his enthusiasm for the theory, the main outline of Streeter's hypothesis has come to stay.

The origin of L (Luke's peculiar matter), and its 'tendencies,' have been variously estimated. There is truth in Cadbury's remark that 'the attempt to establish and distinguish written Greek sources for the passages recorded only by Luke seems doomed to prove unsatisfactory and largely subjective' (*Making of Luke-Acts*,

p. 69). It is all but impossible to distinguish between characteristics due to oral tradition, intermediate redactors, and the final editor. Something will be said in Appendix II of the general and theological attitudes of the Gospel, of which the peculiar matter forms so prominent a part.

MATTER PECULIAR TO LUKE

The following are the more important passages peculiar to Luke:

CHAPTER	VERSES	
I & II		Birth and infancy of John Baptist and Jesus Jesus' visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve.
III	10–14:	John Baptist's practical teaching.
IV	14–30:	Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (Luke is mostly independent of Mark vi. 1 f.).
V	1–11:	Peter and the marvellous catch of fish.
VI	24–26:	The 'Woes'—the converse of the Beatitudes.
VII	11–17:	The widow's son at Nain.
	36–50:	The anointing of Jesus by a sinful woman (cp. Mark xiv. 3 f.).
VIII	1–3:	The women who followed Jesus.
IX	51–56:	Jesus rejected by a Samaritan village.
	61, 62:	A would-be disciple.
X	1, 17–20:	The mission and return of the Seventy.
	25–37:	Parable of the good Samaritan.
	38–42:	Martha and Mary.
XI	5–8:	The friend at midnight.
	27, 28:	A woman blesses Jesus' mother.
XII	13–21:	Parable of the foolish rich man.
	35–38, 47–50, 54–57:	Sayings about the future.
XIII	1–5:	Galileans murdered by Pilate; the fall of a tower in Siloam.
	6–9:	Parable of the fig-tree.
	10–17:	Woman healed on the sabbath.
	31–33:	Herod's hostility.
XIV	1–6:	Man with dropsy healed on the sabbath.
	7–14:	Sayings at a banquet.
	28–33:	Parables on counting the cost.

CHAPTER	VERSES
XV	8–10: Parable of the lost coin.
	11–32: Parable of the prodigal son.
XVI	1–12: Parable of the clever steward.
	19–31: Dives and Lazarus.
XVII	7–10: Parable of a master and his slave.
	11–19: Healing of ten lepers.
	20–22, 28–31: Sayings about the coming of the Son of Man.
XVIII	1–8: Parable of the unprincipled judge.
	9–14: The Pharisee and the 'publican.'
XIX	1–10: Zacchaeus.
	41–44: Jesus' lament over Jerusalem.
XXIII	5–12: Jesus before Herod.
	26–32: The women weeping on the way to Golgotha.
	39–43: The penitent thief.
XXIV	13–43: The walk to Emmaus.
	44–53: The parting at Bethany.

[This list is partly taken from Creed, pp. lxvi–lxvii.]

Study of the foregoing will shew how much popular Christianity has owed to Luke. There are few better known people in Christian tradition than Martha and Mary, Zacchaeus, The Pharisee and the Publican: or more famous stories than the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. COMMENTARIES

The following books will be useful, among others, to students of the Gospel in English:

A. J. GRIEVE in *Peake's Commentary* (T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1919). The student of the Gospels whose library is necessarily limited will do well to invest in this one-volume Commentary. The notes on Mark by H. G. Wood are quite excellent, as are also those on John by A. E. Brooke: and there is much useful matter in Grieve's Matthew and Luke. There are also many valuable articles on the background of New Testament study.

C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (Macmillan, 2nd ed., 1927). By a Liberal Jew. Perhaps the most attractive of all English commentaries: honest, learned and original. Gives very full quotations from other writers. Particularly useful for its vindication of the Jews of Jesus' day.

Lonsdale Ragg, *Saint Luke* (Methuen, 1922). Has some interesting references to Christian art.

A. E. J. Rawlinson, *St Mark* (Methuen, 1925). The best full commentary on Mark in English.

B. GENERAL

The Apocryphal New Testament, trans. by M. R. James (O.U.P., 1924).

B. W. Bacon, *The Story of Jesus* (Allen & Unwin, 1928).

F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (T. & T. Clark, 1906).

By an Unknown Disciple (Hodder & Stoughton, 1918). An extremely suggestive sketch of Jesus' life by an anonymous writer.

H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (Macmillan, 1927). An original and very interesting study of Luke's sources and methods.

R. H. Charles, *Eschatology* (A. & C. Black, 1899).

B. S. Easton, *The Gospel before the Gospels* (Allen & Unwin, 1928). Studies in form-criticism.

C. W. Emmet, *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels; and other studies* (T. & T. Clark, 1911).

T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History* (S.C.M., 1917).

A. Harnack, *Luke the Physician* (Williams & Norgate, 1907).

Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible: (Quoted as *HDB*).

Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels: (Quoted as *HDCG*).

K. Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (Williams & Norgate, 1907).

H. Rashdall, *Conscience and Christ* (Duckworth, 1916). An extremely valuable examination of Jesus' ethical teaching.

E. F. Scott, *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus* (Macmillan, 1924).

B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (Macmillan, 1924). (Quoted as 'Streeter.') Almost indispensable. Full of interest, and most attractively written.

V. TAYLOR, *Behind the Third Gospel* (O.U.P., 1926). Studies in Luke's sources.

J. WARSCHAUER, *The Historical Life of Christ* (Fisher Unwin, 1927). A learned and interesting life of Jesus from a thorough-going apocalyptic standpoint.

(Some of the above deal with the Greek text, but not to such a degree as to make them unintelligible to the student in English.)

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
ST LUKE

FORASMUCH as many have taken in hand to draw 1
up a narrative concerning those matters which have
been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, 2
which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers
of the word, it seemed good to me also, having traced the 3

I. 1–4. PREFACE AND DEDICATION

From at least three points of view, literary, linguistic, and historical, these four verses are of peculiar interest. They are the only case in the N.T. literature of a formal preface—a convention widely current in the Hellenistic age; their language is itself unusually stylistic for a N.T. writer, and in marked contrast with the Hebraic idioms of the Birth stories which follow; and they are the only reference we possess, by an evangelist, to the method and purpose of his work. They have therefore occasioned very full and frequent discussion, not only in commentaries but also in connection with a large number of problems of early Church history and of the literary history of the N.T. The student who desires a fuller treatment of them than can be attempted here may best be referred to Mr H. J. Cadbury's essay in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I, Vol. II, p. 489 f.; and to the same writer's *The Making of Luke-Acts*, pp. 194 f., 344 f. Mr Cadbury's remarks are of special importance as emphasising the conventional nature of such prefaces in view of which it is unsafe to lay too much stress on the particular ideas contained in it. 'Luke,' he says, 'has adopted a few quite obvious and superficial literary conventions without carrying through his work the standards of composition which these affiliations might seem to imply.' This will be further illustrated in the notes below.

1. *many.* Cadbury says: 'This word is apparently frequent in rhetorical prefaces,' quotes many examples (e.g. Acts xxiv. 2 and 10), and concludes: 'In view of the formal nature of the preface as a whole, and of this usage in particular, one must not press the "many" here to mean *very many* predecessors in gospel authorship' (*B. of C.* II, p. 493). That Luke knew and used two is evident, and there may have been more.

2. *the word* means the Christian message in general, as often in Acts. The whole phrase *which from the beginning...the word* describes the Apostles in their twofold capacity as companions of Jesus and the first teachers of His life and message. Cadbury says: 'Luke is following a convention of historians in urging the intimate connection of himself and his associates with the facts themselves,' and quotes close

course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto
4 thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest
know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast
instructed.

parallels from Polybius and Josephus among many others (*B. of C.* II, p. 498).

3. *having traced the course.* What is Luke claiming by this phrase? It seems to have a rather vague sense, 'having become acquainted with,' 'having kept in touch with.' 'There appears to be no warrant for assigning to the word the sense of deliberate investigation, although Luke's apologists love thus to modernise it. The writer's information had come to him as the events took place; it was not the result of special reading or study' (Cadbury, *B. of C.* II, p. 502). The word need not rule out actual participation, but includes written and oral channels of knowledge as well.

in order. Opinions vary as to the sense of this phrase. Some think that Luke is here referring to *chronological* order, in which he believes his work to be an improvement on his predecessors. It seems more probable, however, that he does not mean chronological order so much as 'literary form, or as we should say, "construction." The resultant scheme is a threefold division of the Gospel into a Galilean, a Samaritan and a Judaean section' (Streeter, pp. 423–4). Or, rather more generally, a coherent and logical narrative, 'in which events and sayings are given an appropriate setting' (Grieve). Against the view that chronological order is meant Cadbury notes that 'the early Christians in spite of their interest, from Papias down, in the divergences in order of events in the Gospels, do not appeal in connection with this subject to either of these phrases' (the other is *draw up a narrative* above) 'in the preface' (*B. of C.* II, p. 505).

most excellent Theophilus. It has been thought that the name is symbolic, i.e., as standing for any 'God-lover.' But the use of the epithet, very common at the time as an address to high officials ('Your Excellency') (cf. Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25, of Felix and Festus), suggests that Theophilus was a real person.

4. If Theophilus was not yet a baptised Christian, he had obviously been 'catechised' to some extent.

Cadbury's conclusion is this: 'A study of the language of the preface reveals the ambiguity and uncertainty of many words and phrases in it. Clear and precise deductions... throw much more weight upon the sentence than it was designed to bear' (*B. of C.* II, p. 510). His paraphrase 'with all its imitated obscurity and verbal irregularity' may be useful. 'Whereas many have ventured to recompose a narrative about the matters consummated among us, as those who had been at the start witnesses and helpers in the mission handed down to us, I also, gentle Theophilus, decided to write for you seriatim since I had been now for a long time back in immediate touch with everything circumstantially, in order that you may gather the correctness as regards the accounts that you have been given to understand' (*The Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 347).

THERE was in the days of Herod, king of Judæa, a certain 5
priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abijah: and he had
a wife of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth.
And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the 6
commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. And 7
they had no child, because that Elisabeth was barren, and
they both were *now* well stricken in years.

5–25. ZACHARIAS IS PROMISED A SON

Luke only

Various views are held with regard to the section i. 5–ii. end, which is clearly separate not only from what precedes it but also from the verses which immediately follow it. Some assign it to the hypothetical document L, the source of most of Luke's peculiar information. The arguments against this, which are strong, will be found fully stated in Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, p. 164 f. They rest upon several facts—among them the elaborate date in iii. 1–2, and the way in which John Baptist is there introduced 'like a person who has never yet been mentioned'—which suggest that 'the gospel once was without the first two chapters,' or that iii. 1 is the beginning of another source. If held to be separate, the section can either be regarded as a later addition to the Gospel by another hand than Luke's: or as a Jewish-Christian document incorporated by Luke ('The narrative is not only coloured by endless O.T. reminiscences and built up out of O.T. material, but it reflects Jewish sentiment, feeling and ideals' (Montefiore, I, p. 364)): or again as oral tradition committed to writing by Luke himself, who in this section 'consciously wrote in an archaic style imitative of the Septuagint.' The second of these views is most generally adopted. Here again, however, divergences of opinion are found, for many scholars believe that Luke's Greek version is a translation from a Hebrew or Aramaic original. The recently debated question of Semitic sources underlying this and other portions of the N.T. (e.g. Acts i–xv) is a special study in itself which has hardly up to the present approached any definite or accepted conclusions.

By contrast with the rest of the Gospel the legendary character of much of these two chapters is at once apparent. Their atmosphere is that of the earlier part of the O.T., of supernatural apparition, and human submission and adoration. As has often been noticed, in Matthew's (quite different) narrative of the Birth and Infancy Joseph is the central figure, in Luke's, Mary. These beautiful stories are the imaginative poetry of devotion rather than the sober prose of history.

5. *Herod*: i.e. Herod the Great (40–4 B.C.). *Judæa*: i.e. Palestine, iv. 44 note, vii. 17, xxiii. 5. *course*: a section of priests who were on duty at the Temple for a period of about a week twice a year. There were twenty-four such sections. *Abijah*: 1 Chron. xxiv. 10.

6. *before God*: a Hebraistic phrase, cp. of Noah, Gen. vii. 1: so also *walking in*. Their righteousness is that 'of the Law.'

7. 'Abraham and Sarah are models for the story (Gen. xviii. 11), as

8 Now it came to pass, while he executed the priest's office
9 before God in the order of his course, according to the custom
of the priest's office, his lot was to enter into the temple of
10 the Lord and burn incense. And the whole multitude of the
11 people were praying without at the hour of incense. And
there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on
12 the right side of the altar of incense. And Zacharias was
13 troubled when he saw *him*, and fear fell upon him. But the
angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: because thy sup-

well as Hannah and Elkanah' (Montefiore). Childlessness was regarded as a disgrace among the devout, not only from the point of view of the natural desire that the family should continue, but also because all hope of the Messiah being among the couple's descendants was thus frustrated.

9. The duty of offering the incense was one of those settled among the priests of the course on duty by drawing lots. Incense was offered in the morning and in the evening: and no priest might offer it twice, except in an emergency. The number of priests was very large—several thousands at least.

10. Incense was (and is) a symbol of prayer, and 'the smoke of the incense was a signal for all to prostrate themselves in prayer' (Easton).

11. *on the right*, because on anyone's right is the most honourable position. The angel stands, so to speak, on God's right hand.

The question 'Do you believe in angels?' is perhaps still often enough asked of the Christian apologist as to make appropriate here a few remarks on the supernatural appearances which the Gospels record. In such a case as the present, where there seems little historical foundation for the narrative of which the angel's appearance is part, there is not much to be said. The description is entirely characteristic of the naïve supernaturalism of primitive and popular thought, completely uncritical towards wonders, and naturally assuming material means of communication with mankind from its materially-conceived Deity. Few critics would think it worth while to argue here 'that an inner experience of Zacharias was clothed by a later narrator in the language of O.T. angelic manifestations.' But there are not a few stories in the Synoptic Gospels—notably the Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, Agony—where there seems to be an historical kernel beneath the husk of primitive symbolism. To the modern mind, with its highly spiritual conception of God, the reinterpretation is not difficult. In such cases there underlies the present form of the story a real experience in the spiritual sphere, a knowledge of communication with God as certain as that of the presence of a material messenger such as the story describes—in a language and imagery quite natural, perhaps even inevitable, to the age and minds in which it first took formal shape.

13. *thy supplication.* Some think the story means a prayer for a son, others for the Messianic deliverance.

plication is heard, and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a
son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have 14
joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For 15
he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and he shall drink
no wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy
Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the 16
children of Israel shall he turn unto the Lord their God. And 17
he shall go before his face in the spirit and power of Elijah,
to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the
disobedient *to walk* in the wisdom of the just; to make ready
for the Lord a people prepared *for him*. And Zacharias said 18
unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old
man, and my wife well stricken in years. And the angel 19
answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the
presence of God; and I was sent to speak unto thee, and to
bring thee these good tidings. And behold, thou shalt be 20
silent and not able to speak, until the day that these things
shall come to pass, because thou believedst not my words,
which shall be fulfilled in their season. And the people were 21
waiting for Zacharias, and they marvelled while he tarried
in the temple. And when he came out, he could not speak 22
unto them: and they perceived that he had seen a vision in

John in Hebrew means 'God has been gracious.'

15. *he shall drink no wine nor strong drink.* It is usually assumed that John was to be a 'Nazirite' (Num. vi. 1–21). The name means 'one separated,' that is to say, strictly devoted to religion: the Nazirite was required to abstain from wine, not to cut his hair, and avoid contact with a dead body. But the reference here is too fragmentary to make it clear that this is what is meant. (*HDCG*, art. 'Nazirite.')

17. Cp. Malachi iv. 5–6, 'I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers...,' i.e. the family strife which was ruining the people should cease in the concord of their devotion to God.

18. This perfectly natural question, asked before by Abraham (Gen. xv. 8) and Hezekiah (2 Kings xx. 8) (cp. Gideon: Judg. vi. 36), is punished in *v.* 20 below. Commentators are not often sympathetic to Zacharias: e.g. Plummer, 'by his *for I am an old man etc.*, he almost implies that the Angel must have forgotten the fact' (!)

19. Gabriel's high standing in heaven is guarantee enough of the truth of his words.

22. After the offering of incense the priest, either alone or with others, blessed the people from the Temple steps. This Zacharias cannot do.

the temple: and he continued making signs unto them, and
23 remained dumb. And it came to pass, when the days of his
ministration were fulfilled, he departed unto his house.
24 And after these days Elisabeth his wife conceived; and
25 she hid herself five months, saying, Thus hath the Lord done
unto me in the days wherein he looked upon *me*, to take
away my reproach among men.
26 Now in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from
27 God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin
betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house
28 of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And he came
in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured,
29 the Lord *is* with thee. But she was greatly troubled at the

24. *hid herself*: 'for thanksgiving and prayer; there was no reason for "shame"' (Easton).

25. *reproach*: i.e. her childlessness (*v.* 7 above).

26–38. MARY IS PROMISED A SON

Luke only: but cp. Matt. i. 18 f.

26. John is represented as six months older than Jesus. This explains the date of the Baptist's Day in the Christian Church (June 24th).

27. *betrothed*. In later Jewish times there appears to have been little difference, as regards the position of the couple concerned, between betrothal and marriage—except that presumably the bride remained at her own home. But although a wedding ceremony was usually performed a year afterwards, there seems to have been no reason why betrothed couples should not live as man and wife; and their children were legitimate. There is no mention in the Gospels of any subsequent wedding ceremony between Mary and Joseph. Unfaithfulness on the part of a betrothed person counted as adultery and meant divorce.

of the house of David clearly refers to *Joseph*; not to *virgin*, as some commentators have suggested. The point is interesting, for it raises the question (discussed further in the note on *v.* 34 below) whether Luke's narrative (or source) originally contained the idea of a 'Virgin' Birth. For if the statement of Davidic descent refers to Joseph—the attempt noted above to refer it to Mary is obviously made in the interests of apologetic—it seems to have no value unless Joseph was Jesus' father. To meet this difficulty many Christian commentators hold that the story has in view the fact that as Mary was afterwards Joseph's wife, Joseph was Jesus' *legal* father (though not physically so). Thus Easton: 'In the Levirate marriage the child of a living man was counted as the offspring of his deceased brother. And the child of a wife was so consistently reckoned as the child of her husband that (in later times, at least) a man was not allowed to disinherit a bastard child of his wife's, not even when its paternity was notorious' (p. 11).

saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this
might be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for 30
thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt 31
conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call
his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the 32
Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him
the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the 33
house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be
no end. And Mary said unto the angel, How shall this be, 34

Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 320) says: 'The divine will, in the case of this birth, conferred upon the child its own right of succession, which, once Joseph recognised it, would not have been disputed even by a Jewish judge.' The idea is ridiculed by Montefiore (II, p. 3): and there is considerable force in the contention that 'there is no reason to suppose that the writer had, or was likely to have, in mind the legal relation to Jesus in which Joseph, as husband of Mary, might be considered to stand' (Barnard, *HDCG*, art. 'Genealogies'). At best such a 'legal' descent must have seemed slender evidence for Jesus' Davidic Messiahship: and it is clear that to provide such evidence for propaganda among Jews must have been the primary object with which the genealogies were compiled—or at any rate inserted in the Gospels (cp. iii. 23 note).

31. The wording is the same as in the famous verse in Isaiah: 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel' (vii. 14), words which have constantly been interpreted and quoted in support of the idea of a 'Virgin' Birth. It is sufficient to quote a modern scholar's note for what is generally accepted as the truth on this point: 'The rendering "virgin" is unjustifiable...the word employed here means a young woman of marriageable age, without any suggestion that she is not married' (A. S. Peake in *Peake's Commentary*, p. 442).

Jesus, equivalent to the O.T. 'Joshua,' and popularly accepted as meaning 'Saviour,' or 'God is Salvation.' There seems, however, to be some doubt about this.

32–33. Easton calls these verses 'a typical expression of the Messianic hope of the period.' They contain many O.T. phrases. The Messiah's kingdom, though established on earth, was to become everlasting.

34. The suggestion that this and the following verse are an interpolation, either into the actual text of Luke, or by Luke into the source he is using, is by this time well known. It is supported by the following considerations: (1) The extreme awkwardness and difficulty of Mary's question in *v.* 34 in view of the fact that she was already betrothed and that Joseph has already been mentioned. It would be only too natural for her to look forward eagerly to the birth of a child. (2) The reference to Joseph's Davidic descent (note on *v.* 27 above). As has been said, the reference has far more point if the writer believed that

35 seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said
unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the
power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore
also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son
36 of God. And behold, Elisabeth thy kinswoman, she also hath
conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month
37 with her that was called barren. For no word from God
38 shall be void of power. And Mary said, Behold, the hand-
maid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word.
And the angel departed from her.

Jesus was *in fact* Joseph's son. (3) The use of 'Son of God' in *v.* 35 in a metaphysical sense akin to later Christian thought and quite different from the Messianic 'Son of the Most High' in *v.* 32, a phrase characteristic of Jewish thought. (4) The use of 'parents' in ii. 27 and 43, and 'father' in ii. 33 and 48, with no suggestion of any other than an ordinary relationship. (5) The fact that in ii. 5 the true reading seems to be 'his wife' instead of 'who was betrothed to him' (see note there). (6) The fact that Mary's question seems to be just as much an expression of incredulity as Zacharias' question in *v.* 18: Mary is not, however, punished but praised for her faith (*v.* 45 below). In reply to these points it is argued ((1) and (6)) that an *immediate* conception is the idea conveyed by the Hebrew source underlying the Greek, and that Mary's question is natural, and not incredulity but surprise: ((2) and (3)) that although for genealogical purposes it was necessary to link Jesus to previous generations through Joseph, the compiler intended to suggest the idea of Jesus as the second Adam—and so traces His descent back to the first Adam—who like the first owes His human existence to a direct act on God's part: (4) and (5) are regarded as without significance. It is further argued that the prominence of Mary in Luke's story is best explained by knowledge of the miraculous conception. The case for the full text can be seen argued at length in *HDCG*, art. 'Virgin Birth,' by G. H. Box (or by the same writer in his book *The Virgin Birth*; or by Easton and Lonsdale Ragg *ad loc.*): it does not convince the present writer.

35. It may be of value, at this point, to summarise the evidence of the N.T. with regard to the miraculous conception of Jesus. The only explicit reference to the belief is in Matt. i. 18–25—apart from the passage in Luke discussed above, which, as has been shewn, is at least capable of a different interpretation. There is no mention of the belief in Mark, John, Acts, Paul or the Epistle to the Hebrews—in the rest of the N.T. in fact. The 'argument from silence' is usually somewhat precarious, but it may fairly be said that on the one hand there are several passages both in Paul (e.g. when discussing the Fall and the Atonement), and in John (whose chief aim is to shew Jesus as the Son of God), where we are much surprised to find that the authors, if they knew of it or considered it true, do not refer to the belief. There are, on the other hand, a number of passages which are hard to reconcile

And Mary arose in these days and went into the hill 39
country with haste, into a city of Judah; and entered into 40
the house of Zacharias and saluted Elisabeth. And it came 41
to pass, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the
babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the
Holy Ghost; and she lifted up her voice with a loud cry, and 42
said, Blessed *art* thou among women, and blessed *is* the fruit
of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of 43
my Lord should come unto me? For behold, when the voice 44
of thy salutation came into mine ears, the babe leaped in my
womb for joy. And blessed *is* she that believed; for there 45

with the belief. For example, apart from Luke ii. 43 and 48, and iii. 22 referred to above, Mark iii. 21, 31–35 (the behaviour of Mary and the brothers of Jesus), Rom. i. 3 ('of the seed of David according to the flesh'), viii. 3 ('God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh'), John i. 45 ('Jesus of Nazareth, son of Joseph'), vi. 42 ('Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know'). These and others will be found discussed in an interesting pamphlet by Mr T. F. Royds, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, No. 8 of a series called 'Papers in Modern Churchmanship' (Longmans, 1925, 3*d*.). It is perhaps hardly necessary to emphasise the fact that acceptance or rejection of the belief will not depend solely, or perhaps even principally, on the N.T. evidence.

39–56. MARY VISITS ELIZABETH

Luke only

The intimacy between Mary and Elizabeth described in this chapter, together with the interpretation by A.V. of 'kinswoman' in *v.* 36 above as 'cousin'—the relationship denoted by the word is really quite vague—has led to the tradition that Jesus and John were playmates in their youth. This does not 'correspond with what we may gather of the dealings between Jesus and John as depicted in the more historical portions of the Gospels' (Montefiore). There is no evidence, for instance, in the earlier accounts of the Baptism (Mark i. 9 f., Luke iii. 21 f.) that John recognised Jesus: cf. also John's question from prison (vii. 19).

39. *the hill country*; to the south, round Hebron (and Tekoah, where Amos came from), nearly 100 miles from Nazareth.

41. The idea is that the unborn John supernaturally recognised and acknowledged the mother of the Messiah—or the Messiah himself if the child of Mary is thought of as already conceived.

46 f. *The Magnificat.* This hymn, like the *Benedictus* (*v.* 68 f.) and *Nunc Dimittis* (ii. 29 f.) is full of O.T. thought and phrasing. The Magnificat Easton describes as 'a Messianic psalm that might have been used by any Jew of the period' (with the exception of *v.* 48). Critics differ widely with regard to the origin of these hymns: some

shall be a fulfilment of the things which have been spoken
46 to her from the Lord. And Mary said,
My soul doth magnify the Lord,
47 And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.

think them Luke's own composition—in a 'poetic and Biblical lyric style'; others that their thought and style is clearly indicative of a Hebrew or Aramaic source, translated by Luke. In this case they may have been composed and used in the early Palestinian Church. This seems the most probable view: for not only does the general vagueness of these hymns 'suggest that they were not deliberately composed at a later date to fit the supposed circumstances,' but also 'it is hard to believe that either Luke or any other Christian poet could have had the dramatic genius, for it required no less, to think himself back so completely' (into not only the O.T. language but the expectant Messianism of the period just before the life of Jesus) 'unless he had considerable and authentic materials to guide him.' (The quotations are from an essay 'Should the Magnificat be ascribed to Elizabeth?' in *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels* by the late C. W. Emmet —a book full of interest and suggestiveness.)

46. *And Mary said.* Instead of 'Mary,' 'Elizabeth' is read here by some MSS. On this view the Magnificat is represented as Elizabeth's song, not Mary's; whether the original text contained the name Elizabeth, or, as most of those who do not support the ordinary text think much more probable, simply the words 'and she said,' without the mention of any name. (It is exceedingly difficult to account for the reading 'Elizabeth' as a correction of an original 'Mary.') The two different names supplied are then alternative explanations of the original text.

The point is of more sentimental than practical importance: and a full treatment will not be attempted here. The essay by Emmet mentioned above is a clear discussion supporting the ascription to Mary (cp. also *HDCG*, art. 'Magnificat'): on the other side see Loisy (*Luc*, p. 98 f.), or much more shortly Grieve in *Peake's Commentary, ad loc.* The following considerations appear to be much in favour of the ascription to Elizabeth: (1) The clear parallelism between *v.* 42 and *v.* 67. (2) The clear reference to Hannah's song (under similar circumstances to those of Elizabeth) in 1 Sam. ii. 1 f. (3) The natural sense of the passage if read without the prejudice of long tradition (assuming the reading 'and she said' only), e.g. particularly the repetition of 'Mary' at the beginning of *v.* 56. [The chief O.T. parallels to the Magnificat are as follows: *v.* 46, 1 Sam. ii. 1; *vv.* 47, 48, 1 Sam. i. 11; *v.* 48, Gen. xxx. 13; *v.* 49, Deut. x. 21, Ps. cxi. 9; *v.* 50, Ps. ciii. 17; *v.* 51, Ps. lxxxix. 11; *v.* 52, Job xii. 19, Job v. 11; *v.* 53, 1 Sam. ii. 7, Ps. cvii. 9; *v.* 54, Isa. xli. 8, Ps. xcviii. 3; *v.* 55, Micah vii. 20, 2 Sam. xxii. 51.]

46–47. In the characteristic method of Hebrew poetry—so familiar in the Psalms—the second half of the sentence repeats in different words the sense of the first.

For he hath looked upon the low estate of his hand- 48
maiden:
For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call
me blessed.
For he that is mighty hath done to me great things; 49
And holy is his name.
And his mercy is unto generations and generations 50
On them that fear him.
He hath shewed strength with his arm; 51
He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their
heart.
He hath put down princes from *their* thrones, 52
And hath exalted them of low degree.
The hungry he hath filled with good things; 53
And the rich he hath sent empty away.
He hath holpen Israel his servant, 54
That he might remember mercy
(As he spake unto our fathers) 55
Toward Abraham and his seed for ever.

And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned 56
unto her house.

Now Elisabeth's time was fulfilled that she should be 57
delivered; and she brought forth a son. And her neighbours 58
and her kinsfolk heard that the Lord had magnified his mercy
towards her; and they rejoiced with her. And it came to 59
pass on the eighth day, that they came to circumcise the

48. 'The language is more appropriate to Elizabeth. *Low estate* does not naturally here mean "humble social condition" but "humiliation," i.e. of childlessness. Cp. 1 Sam. i. 11, where the LXX has the same word' (Montefiore).

56. It is not clearly stated that Mary left before John's birth (*v.* 36, 'this is the sixth month': 'about three months'), though the arrangement suggests it.

57–80. BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF JOHN

Luke only

58. *had magnified his mercy towards her*: a very Hebrew phrase, 'had made great his mercy in dealing with her.'

59. Cp. Gen. xvii. 10 f. Of the more radical critics Montefiore (I, p. 373) makes the downright statement: 'In the O.T. the giving of the name is not deferred till the eighth day, nor is it a matter for the relatives but for the parents. The unusual arrangement is devised to

child; and they would have called him Zacharias, after the
60 name of his father. And his mother answered and said, Not
61 so; but he shall be called John. And they said unto her,
There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name.
62 And they made signs to his father, what he would have him
63 called. And he asked for a writing tablet, and wrote, saying,
64 His name is John. And they marvelled all. And his mouth
was opened immediately, and his tongue *loosed*, and he spake,
65 blessing God. And fear came on all that dwelt round about
them: and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout
66 all the hill country of Judæa. And all that heard them laid
them up in their heart, saying, What then shall this child be?
For the hand of the Lord was with him.

67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost,
and prophesied, saying,

68 Blessed *be* the Lord, the God of Israel;
For he hath visited and wrought redemption for his
people,

69 And hath raised up a horn of salvation for us

set off Elizabeth's protest.' Loisy, however, agrees with Lagrange that the name was naturally given at the moment when (as in Christian Baptism) the child was made a member of the community by the performance of the rite. [There is evidence for this from the eighth century A.D. onwards.] The latter suggests also that the custom may have originated from the fact that Abraham's was changed from Abram by God when He ordained circumcision (Gen. xvii. 5). In any case it seems unlikely that the author of this Palestinian story would have described anything but a normal procedure at the time of writing: although it is true enough that in O.T. times the name was regularly given at the time of birth (*Enc. Bibl.* art. 'Circumcision').

It was much more common in antiquity to name a child after his grandfather than after his father.

62. Zacharias is apparently deaf as well as dumb.

65. *sayings*, in the O.T. sense of 'events'—'the subject-matter of narration' (Plummer).

67 f. *The Benedictus*: cp. note on *v.* 46 f. above. As with the Magnificat, so here the references to its particular context seem to be on the surface of the hymn, and may well be due to editorial revision. [The chief O.T. parallels are *v.* 68, Ps. xli. 13, xci. 9; *v.* 69, Ps. cxxxii. 17, Ezek. xxix. 21, 1 Sam. ii. 10; *vv.* 70–72, Ps. cvi. 10, Micah vii. 20, Ps. cvi. 45; *vv.* 73–75, Ex. ii. 24, Jer. xi. 5, Ps. cv. 8; *v.* 76, Malachi iii. 1, Isa. xl. 3; *v.* 79, Isa. xlii. 7, ix. 1, Ps. cvii. 10.]

68. *visited*, i.e. 'consoled.'

69. 'The metaphor of the horn is very frequent in O.T. (1 Sam. ii. 10 etc.) and is taken neither from the horns of the altar, nor from the

In the house of his servant David
(As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which 70
have been since the world began),
Salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all 71
that hate us;
To shew mercy towards our fathers, 72
And to remember his holy covenant;
The oath which he sware unto Abraham our father, 73
To grant unto us that we being delivered out of the 74
hand of our enemies
Should serve him without fear,
In holiness and righteousness before him all our days. 75
Yea and thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the 76
Most High:
For thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to make
ready his ways;
To give knowledge of salvation unto his people 77
In the remission of their sins,
Because of the tender mercy of our God, 78

peak of helmets or head-dresses, but from the horns of animals, especially bulls. It represents, therefore, primarily, neither safety nor dignity, but strength' (Plummer). He compares Horace's *addis cornua pauperi* and Ovid's *tum pauper cornua sumit*. The 'horn' is the Messiah, of whose conception Zacharias has inspired knowledge: *Salvation* in *v.* 71 is in apposition to it.

72. 'The "fathers" receive "mercy" when the Messianic kingdom is established; they appear to be thought of as alive and waiting' (Easton).

73. The reference is to God's oath in Gen. xxii. 16–18.

74. The vision of this and the next verse is of a time when the people should be delivered from heathen oppressors and serve God faithfully in the holiness of the Law.

77. Cp. iii. 3: 'the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins.' Two somewhat different interpretations of this rather vague sentence are possible. (1) Taking *in the remission* with *salvation*, 'to give knowledge of salvation which is found in the remission of sins': i.e. John would shew the people that 'salvation' consisted not in deliverance from Rome, but in spiritual deliverance from sin. (2) Taking *in the remission* with *to give*, and taking *knowledge* in the sense of 'assurance,' 'to give, through the remission of sins, assurance of salvation': i.e. John's baptism and its results were evidence to the people that the Messianic salvation was near.

78. The idea of the second clause is from Isa. ix. 2: 'The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in

Whereby the dayspring from on high shall visit us,
79 To shine upon them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death;
To guide our feet into the way of peace.
80 And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his shewing unto Israel.
2 Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled.

the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.' 'The dayspring (lit. 'rising,' of a heavenly body) from on high' is the Messiah and his radiant glory.

shall visit us: some MSS read 'hath visited us.' The future is rather more 'difficult' as it involves a change of thought from the perfects of *v.* 68 above; and is therefore probably original. The Messianic salvation is regarded, at the beginning of the hymn, as already begun; but *v.* 76 f. turn to the thought of John's work in the future, and the emphasis alters.

79. *the way of peace*, i.e. as described in *vv.* 74–75 above.

80. Although he seems to say so, Luke probably does not mean that John was still a *child* when *in the deserts*, but that the 'child' of *v.* 66 above grew up and withdrew to the 'deserts' for a period of seclusion and meditation before his work began. Some think this verse originally followed *v.* 66, and that what lies between has been inserted later. The 'deserts' are presumably the barren country to the west of the Dead Sea.

II. 1–5. THE ENROLMENT

Luke only

Luke's narrative here touches on secular history, and the statements made in the first three verses of this chapter have caused an immense amount of discussion. Criticism has centred round these three questions: (1) Secular history knows nothing of a general enrolment in Augustus' time; or of any enrolment in Syria, of which province Judaea became part in A.D. 6, before that year. According to Josephus this census (in A.D. 6) caused great opposition as the first of its kind. The enrolment mentioned by Luke is represented as having taken place before Herod's death in 4 B.C. (Luke i. 5). (2) Quirinius is known to have been legate of Syria from A.D. 6–9, and to have carried out the enrolment referred to above (cp. Acts v. 37). From 9 to 6 B.C., however, Sentius Saturninus was legate; from 6 to 4 Quinctilius Varus. (3) Would—or could—the Romans have ordered a census in his dominions during Herod's lifetime when Judaea was an independent kingdom? Would a census conducted by any normal Roman method have brought Joseph to Bethlehem, the home of his tribal ancestor David?

Sir William Ramsay's *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* is a thoroughgoing defence of Luke's accuracy in every detail published at a time (1898) when to acknowledge historical error in an evangelist still seemed to many to be a betrayal of the citadel of Christian truth. Nevertheless, it is perhaps the best detailed study of the subject for the English reader, characterised as it is by a burning enthusiasm for vindicating Luke's accuracy and by the presentation of much new (at that date) archaeological evidence. Together with Ramsay's later writings on the subject (*The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the N.T.*—p. 222 f.; also art. in *Expositor*, Nov. 1912), it has done much to refute the view that an event in secular history referred to only by a Christian writer must necessarily be unhistorical. Much of Ramsay's reasoning is, however, thin and unconvincing—because he attempts too much. It is well to remember, too, that the general historical worth of a document is not necessarily invalidated by inaccuracy of detail on certain points. 'The same work,' says Cadbury of Luke's Gospel, 'can be relatively more true in some parts than in others, and not equally reliable in its various types of information' (*The Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 367). Luke's information with regard to events in earlier Jewish history may well, for instance, be less reliable than what he relates in the second half of Acts. If, moreover, it is held that in the section i. 5–ii. end Luke is incorporating (perhaps with some revision) an older written source, the responsibility for any errors cannot with any certainty be attached to the evangelist himself.

(1) That Luke may be in error in exaggerating an enrolment in Syria (or simply Judaea) into an enrolment throughout the whole Roman Empire is not impossible. Yet the silence of secular history with regard to a general enrolment is not conclusive; for it is clear from the archaeological discoveries of the past thirty years that Augustus did establish a system of periodic enrolments in some parts of his empire. That such a system was in force in Syria as early as this does not, however, seem to have been demonstrated: and the evidence of Josephus is, so far as it goes, against this. So also is the evidence of a recently discovered inscription of Cyrene, dated 7–6 B.C. (Creed, p. 29).

(2) It is generally agreed, on the authority of an inscription which although containing no name is always held to refer to Quirinius, that his governorship of Syria in A.D. 6 following was his second term of office. It is difficult, however, to see how his first governorship could have been before Herod's death unless before those of Saturninus and Varus, i.e. as early as 10 B.C. This is Ramsay's later suggestion on the ground of an inscription discovered by him at Antioch in Pisidia in 1912: he formerly held that Quirinius might have been entrusted by Augustus with a special mission in Syria *during* the governorship of Saturninus. If Jesus was born as early as 10 B.C., or earlier, he could hardly be said to be 'about 30' in A.D. 28 (Luke iii. 23); on other grounds there seems to be no objection to this earlier date.

Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* IV. 19) says that Jesus was born at the time of a census held *by Sentius Saturninus* (instead of Quirinius). Of this Easton says: 'The evidence of Tertullian may be accepted without hesitation despite the unvarying testimony of the manuscripts' (of

Luke). 'Tertullian could have found the name only in his copy of the Gospel, for his faith in Biblical inspiration was such as to forbid his questioning a fact related in the Bible, no matter what the external evidence might be. Moreover, his historical knowledge is notoriously inaccurate.... The evidence of Josephus and (perhaps) aid from oral tradition would render the change of "Saturninus" into "Quirinius" easily comprehensible, but the reverse change would have occurred only to a scribe with an intimate knowledge of Syrian history, together with precise information as to the date of Christ's birth. And such scribes did not exist' (p. 20). If this view is accepted the difficulty disappears. It is somewhat hard, however, to believe that between Tertullian's time (c. A.D. 200) and our earliest MSS all trace of the original reading should have *completely* vanished—even though the influence of assimilation and correction upon our MSS is steadily being more highly estimated.

(3) There is evidence in Josephus that during Saturninus' governorship Herod had incurred Augustus' displeasure, and was slighted and ignored by the emperor in consequence. It is not *impossible*, therefore, that the Romans should have directly exercised their authority in Judaea at the time: but it is highly *improbable*.

Normally, at a Roman census everyone was enrolled at his home, for taxes were on property, not income. Those who were away from home had to return, at some time during a given year, for enrolment. Joseph was living at Nazareth: but it is suggested that Herod, if ordered by the Romans to hold a census, may have endeavoured to make the operation less distasteful to his subjects by employing a method of enrolment which would appeal to their patriotic sentiment. Genealogical knowledge and pride was considerable among the Jews: enrolment at the tribal ancestor's home would serve to cloak the degradation of the submission to an inquisition by a foreign power. Palestine is not a large country, and the inconvenience caused would not be unduly great.

Such conjecture is not, perhaps, unconvincing, so far as Joseph is concerned. But it is extremely difficult to see why Mary, in her condition at the time, should have accompanied him. [Clearly, as the story makes her accompany Joseph, it must regard her as his *wife*, not his betrothed: see note on *v.* 5 below.] Bethlehem is some 70 miles from Nazareth and the journey there and back would take perhaps eight days. No convincing answer has been given to this objection. Granted that an affectionate couple would not wish to be separated at such a time, there seems no reason whatever why the journey should have been undertaken just at that moment, if all that was required was that Joseph should present himself for enrolment at Bethlehem at some time during a prescribed period. [Ramsay's answer to this objection is a good illustration of what he himself describes elsewhere as 'the complete blindness of the historical critic with a bad theory to maintain.' He says: 'That a day was fixed by the authorities and that it was not left to the discretion of the people to go when they pleased (as in Egypt people seem to have been permitted to send in their enrolment papers at any time they pleased within the year), seems to follow from

This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was 2
governor of Syria. And all went to enrol themselves, every 3
one to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, 4
out of the city of Nazareth, into Judæa, to the city of David,
which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and
family of David; to enrol himself with Mary, who was be- 5

the fact that Joseph and Mary travelled from Nazareth to Bethlehem at the very time when the birth of the child was approaching' (*Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* p. 192). The 'answer' to the difficulty is simply the difficulty itself!]

From this brief summary of the evidence it will be seen that there is at least some truth in Montefiore's words (II, p. 377) that 'the total number of unlikely suppositions which have to be made before Luke's story...can be regarded as historical, is very large.' It is simpler, in view of the general characteristics presented by the material used by Luke in these first two chapters, to conclude that tradition has erred, not only in placing the census of Quirinius (of A.D. 6) in the reign of Herod the Great: but also in connecting the birth of Jesus with Bethlehem (under the influence of prophecy: cp. especially Micah v. 2), the home of David and therefore Messiah's fit birthplace; and in reconciling this presupposition with the well-established tradition of the home at Nazareth by means of the supposed exigencies of the census. That the details of Jesus' birth and infancy should be buried in obscurity is in complete agreement with the striking lack of interest in His earthly life characteristic of Paul and the early Church. As has been said above, the worth of Luke's history of Jesus is not thereby destroyed.

2. *first.* Those who believe that Quirinius held a census in Judaea before Herod's death maintain that Luke uses the word here to distinguish that census from the one which he held in A.D. 6: 'This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria'; those who hold that Luke is confused take 'first' as meaning simply the first held in the province: 'This, the first enrolment ever held in Judaea, took place when Quirinius was governor of Syria.'

Quirinius is frequently referred to by Tacitus (*Ann.* II. 30, III. 22, 23, 48) and by Suetonius (*Tib.* XLIX): as well as in the inscription mentioned above. He was a successful general, as well as proconsul of Asia and twice governor of Syria. He died in A.D. 21.

4. 'Now David was the son of that Ephrathite of Beth-lehem-judah, whose name was Jesse' (1 Sam. xvii. 12): 'Thou Bethlehem...though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel' (Micah v. 2).

5. Most MSS read '*who was betrothed to him*': some however read 'his wife.' Later MSS combine the two readings, 'his betrothed wife.' Clearly 'with Mary his wife' is the original reading: everything would be against its introduction, if not original. (Cp. note at beginning of section, last paragraph but one: and note on i. 34.)

6 trothed to him, being great with child. And it came to pass,
while they were there, the days were fulfilled that she should
7 be delivered. And she brought forth her firstborn son; and
she wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a
manger, because there was no room for them in the inn.
8 And there were shepherds in the same country abiding in
9 the field, and keeping watch by night over their flock. And
an angel of the Lord stood by them, and the glory of the
Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid.
10 And the angel said unto them, Be not afraid; for behold,
I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all
11 the people: for there is born to you this day in the city of
12 David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this *is* the
sign unto you; Ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling

6–7. THE BIRTH OF JESUS

Luke only

An interesting treatment of the origins of these clearly traditional stories (*vv.* 6–20) will be found in Creed, pp. 30–32, where their affinities with Egyptian and Jewish legend are discussed.

7. *firstborn* naturally implies the birth of other subsequent children: cp. viii. 19 note. The translation *in a manger* is a familiar detail of the picture of Jesus' birth in a stable with the animals standing near. But that Christmas Day should be on Dec. 25th is a tradition which dates only from the fourth century; and the fact that the shepherds are represented as out on the hill-sides with their flocks at night seems to shew that the story contemplates a time of year other than the depth of winter. The Greek word translated 'manger' may mean a 'pen' or 'trough'; in that case the birth of Jesus may be regarded as having taken place in the open air. *in the inn*: Luke uses this word again in xxii. 11, where it clearly means a 'room,' not 'inn.' It is best to give it that sense here and not to enquire what 'room' it was. One can pay homage to the beauty of this picture of God's humility without requiring logic in every detail.

8–20. THE SHEPHERDS AND THE ANGELS

Luke only

Few notes are needed for this beautiful tale—pastoral poetry, not history.

10. *to all the people*, i.e. the Jews.

11. *Christ the Lord*: i.e. 'the Lord Messiah.' The word 'Christ' is, of course, the English equivalent of a Greek word meaning 'anointed,' which is itself a translation of the Hebrew word 'Messiah.'

12. *sign*, i.e. that what they said was true.

clothes, and lying in a manger. And suddenly there was 13
with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising
God, and saying,

Glory to God in the highest, 14
And on earth peace among men in whom he is well
pleased.

And it came to pass, when the angels went away from them 15
into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now
go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing that is come to
pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us. And they 16
came with haste, and found both Mary and Joseph, and the
babe lying in the manger. And when they saw it, they made 17
known concerning the saying which was spoken to them
about this child. And all that heard it wondered at the 18
things which were spoken unto them by the shepherds. But 19
Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart.
And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for 20
all the things that they had heard and seen, even as it was
spoken unto them.

And when eight days were fulfilled for circumcising him, 21
his name was called JESUS, which was so called by the angel
before he was conceived in the womb.

14. Another reading gives the familiar words of A.V., 'on earth peace, good will toward (among) men.' The 'good will' can be understood either of God's favour to men, or man's good disposition towards God. The A.V. reading gives the easier sense, 'on earth peace; God's grace reigning among men' (Easton): or 'on earth peace; responsiveness among men towards God.' With the R.V. reading the sense will be 'on earth peace among those on whom God's favour has fallen,' i.e. the Jews: or 'on earth peace among those who respond,' i.e. peace will be the reward of those who accept the Messiah. Messiah's birth brings to God honour, and to men who accept him, peace. This is the most appropriate meaning.

18. *all that heard it*, i.e. the bystanders at Bethlehem, when the shepherds told of their vision.

19. This verse 'is undoubtedly meant to point to what Luke believed to be the source of the story' (Easton). Cp. *v.* 51 below. If Mary had really 'kept all these things in her heart,' could she have acted as she did in the undoubtedly historical incident in Mark iii. 20–35?

21. THE CIRCUMCISION OF JESUS

Luke only

22 And when the days of their purification according to the
law of Moses were fulfilled, they brought him up to Jeru-
23 salem, to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the law
of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be
24 called holy to the Lord), and to offer a sacrifice according to
that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtle-
25 doves, or two young pigeons. And behold, there was a man
in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and this man was
righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel:
26 and the Holy Spirit was upon him. And it had been revealed
unto him by the Holy Spirit, that he should not see death,
27 before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And he came in the
Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the
child Jesus, that they might do concerning him after the
28 custom of the law, then he received him into his arms, and
blessed God, and said,

22–39. THE 'REDEMPTION' OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE

Luke only

Creed discusses here a suggested parallel to the Simeon episode from Buddhist literature (pp. 37–8).

22. *the days*: forty days from the birth: the quotation is from Leviticus xii. q.v. *their* is difficult, for Leviticus said nothing about the father. A singular pronoun (masc. or fem.) is read by a few MSS. There seems little doubt that 'her' was the original reading, which was altered because of the difficulty of believing that the mother of Christ could have needed purification.

23. The quotation is (not exactly) from Ex. xiii. 2 and 13, a passage which describes how in memory of the sparing of the Hebrew first-born at the Exodus the first-born were to be 'sanctified unto the Lord.' 'All the first-born of men among thy children shalt thou redeem,' i.e. with a payment (5 shekels: Num. xviii. 16). This need not have been, but by those living near might have been, done in the Temple.

24. This is the offering for Mary's purification. The regular offering was a lamb and a pigeon: but 'if she be not able to bring a lamb, then she shall bring two turtles, or two young pigeons; the one for the burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be clean' (Lev. xii. 8).

25. *looking for the consolation of Israel.* The eagerness of his longing for Messiah's coming had, as the next verse describes, been rewarded by the promise that he should not die with his longing unsatisfied. Cp. the description of Joseph of Arimathaea as 'looking for the kingdom of God' (xxiii. 51).

27. *in the Spirit*, i.e. under Divine prompting. For the significance of the use of *the parents* here, cp. i. 34 note.

Now lettest thou thy servant depart, O Lord, 29
According to thy word, in peace;
For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, 30
Which thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples; 31
A light for revelation to the Gentiles, 32
And the glory of thy people Israel.
And his father and his mother were marvelling at the 33
things which were spoken concerning him; and Simeon 34
blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold, this
child is set for the falling and rising up of many in Israel;

29 f. *The Nunc Dimittis*: cp. i. 46 note. He can now die in peace, his longing satisfied. [O.T. references are: *v.* 30, Isa. xl. 5 (LXX), cp. Luke iii. 6; Isa. lii. 10; *v.* 31, Ps. xcviii. 2; *v.* 32, Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 6, etc.]

32. *A light for revelation to the Gentiles.* The darkness that covers the nations is removed and they are brought into the light of truer knowledge. This post-exilic missionary ideal in Israel is most clearly seen in the second of the 'Servant Songs,' Isa. xlix. 1–6; where the Servant's conception of his task is widened to include the conversion of the Gentiles. Cp. also Paul's discussion of the theme in Rom. ix–xi.

The *glory* is for Israel, of her great task done.

33. Cp. 'the parents' in *v.* 27 above. Not only does the story appear to have no knowledge of the Miraculous Conception, but it implies ignorance of the Annunciation—why otherwise should Joseph and Mary be described as *marvelling*? Luke himself may have 'felt that the explicit prediction of the Messiah's illumination of the Gentiles was a new feature in the prophecies of the Nativity,' but 'no Jew would think that the "light to lighten the Gentiles" added anything to the functions included in "Messiah"' (Easton).

34. *is set for*: 'is destined to bring about.' For the language of what follows cf. Isa. viii. 14. The best commentary on the thought is John iii. 16 f., e.g. 'This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light...' (19–21). Messiah's coming must mean a testing: by their attitude towards him, and the consequent revelation of their true character, men will bring about their own condemnation or salvation. And the result will be often surprising: 'many first shall be last, and last first.' Cp. James Russell Lowell's lines:

'Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide
In the strife of truth with falsehood
For the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Offering each the bloom or blight,

35 and for a sign which is spoken against; yea and a sword shall pierce through thine own soul; that thoughts out of many
36 hearts may be revealed. And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher (she was of a great age, having lived with a husband seven years
37 from her virginity, and she had been a widow even for fourscore and four years), which departed not from the temple, worshipping with fastings and supplications night and day.
38 And coming up at that very hour she gave thanks unto God, and spake of him to all them that were looking for the
39 redemption of Jerusalem. And when they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth.

Parts the goats upon the left hand
And the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by for ever
'Twixt that darkness and that light.

Then to side with truth is noble
When we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause brings fame and profit
And 'tis prosperous to be just.
Then it is the brave man chooses,
While the coward stands aside,
Doubting in his abject spirit,
Till his Lord is crucified,
And the multitude make virtue
Of the faith they had denied.'

35. *yea and a sword etc.* A vivid phrase to express the Mother's grief at the rejection of the 'sign'—her Son.

36. Luke has made a very awkward sentence out of the description of Anna: and it is not clear how old she is stated to be. If he means that she had been a widow for 84 years after seven years of married life, she is well over 100. Others think that the 84 years is her age, including her youth, married life, and—in that case—about 60 years of widowhood.

Warschauer says of these stories of Simeon and Anna, 'While they are not records of fact, they attest the fervent expectation which that age cherished of a Messiah who should be sprung from the old royal line and reign over his people after throwing off the Roman yoke. It was this rôle which popular imagination mistakenly assigned to Jesus —this hope which He failed to fulfil in the sense that He never attempted to fulfil it' (*The Historical Life of Christ*, p. 21).

39. Clearly independent of Matthew's traditions of the flight into Egypt and the coming to Nazareth afterwards (Matt. ii).

And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: 40
and the grace of God was upon him.

And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast 41
of the passover. And when he was twelve years old, they 42

40–end. THE BOY JESUS

Luke only

40. Cp. what is said of John in i. 80 above: and also *v.* 52 below. This passage—the only glimpse of Jesus' boyhood which our canonical Gospels give us—should be compared with the numerous stories of Him as child and boy told by the apocryphal gospels, stories of wizardry and conscious self-assertion as unattractive as they are fantastic. Miraculously increasing the length of a plank for Joseph in the carpenter's shop, turning into a withered tree a playmate who has irritated Him, striking dead on the spot a teacher who has punished Him—such are the distorted pictures of Jesus' boyhood which the later gospels offer. [The examples quoted are from the so-called 'Gospel of Thomas,' which will be found, with many others, in a single volume, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, translated by M. R. James (O.U.P.).] Seen against such a background the simplicity and restraint of this story is evident. It may well rest on fact—perhaps with some developments in transmission, e.g. in *vv.* 49 and 50. If it does not, history itself could not be more natural.

The story suggests, though it does not definitely state, that this was Jesus' *first* visit to Jerusalem. If this is so, Dr B. W. Bacon's description of the occasion as Jesus' 'Confirmation' (*The Story of Jesus*, p. 77) is apt. It would be the time when, on reaching puberty, the boy would for the first time share in the observance of the festival, thus becoming a 'son of the Law.'

Yet, natural as Luke's story is, the somewhat archaic phraseology of *vv.* 40 and 52, together with the mistaken reverence of orthodox theology, has obscured the real humanity of the Boy who is its Hero. Jesus grew up at Nazareth with His parents, a natural human Boy. Dr Bacon, after describing this incident in the Temple, goes on: 'In answer to His parents' exclamation of surprise the Boy said: "Where would you expect to find Me? I was interested in things which concern My Father in heaven." If you mean by the sinlessness of Jesus that He had from childhood that kind of a spirit, then the little anecdote has some bearing on the question. If you only mean the mere negative idea of faultlessness, that even in boyhood He never disobeyed His mother or was late to school, or got into scrapes with other boys in Nazareth, the early witnesses were not interested in such questions. If we have their conception of Jesus' holiness, we shall not be, either' (p. 78).

It is not, then, mere imagination to see in the story the first uprising in Jesus' mind of what to-day we should call a sense of vocation—the answer to the question that every boy must ask and answer, 'What am I to be?' Jesus may have had many ambitions in His early boyhood—

43 went up after the custom of the feast; and when they had
fulfilled the days, as they were returning, the boy Jesus
tarried behind in Jerusalem; and his parents knew it not;
44 but supposing him to be in the company, they went a day's
journey; and they sought for him among their kinsfolk and
45 acquaintance: and when they found him not, they returned
46 to Jerusalem, seeking for him. And it came to pass, after
three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst
of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions:
47 and all that heard him were amazed at his understanding and
48 his answers. And when they saw him, they were astonished:
and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus
dealt with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing.

to succeed Joseph in the carpenter's trade—to be a merchant and travel far and wide like the cavalcades He used to watch passing through the village street—to be a soldier and fight the Romans. Yet He is vaguely conscious of deeper aspirations—more thoughtful, perhaps, than His fellows—and at such a time as this His interest turns eagerly to the sphere with which He feels His life is somehow to be concerned, His people's religion.

43. Jesus stays behind, attracted by all that He saw around Him in the Temple. How many of us can remember some similar land-mark in our own lives—perhaps, as with Jesus, a visit to some specially suggestive place, or a meeting with some magnetic personality, or words heard or read!

44. *in the company*, 'in the caravan,' a number of friends and relatives travelling together. Jesus would be missed at night.

46. *after three days*—the day they spent in travelling *from* Jerusalem, the day they spent in travelling *back*, and the day on which they found Him? Commentators regard this as the most probable method of reckoning (cp. the same phrase used of the Resurrection in Mark viii. 31).

Luke's phrase, of which the literal translation is 'listening to them and asking *further* questions,' completely negatives the persistent picture of the scene which popular tradition has created—of Jesus 'laying down the law' to a circle of astonished (and somewhat disgruntled) Rabbis. He is an eager listener who follows up what He hears with questions of His own. 'The Rabbis taught separately. But there were many of them in the Temple, each surrounded by his pupils; Luke's implication is that Christ had been going from teacher to teacher. The masters occupied raised seats, while their scholars sat on the ground (cf. Acts xxii. 3). The method of teaching was highly catechetical, the instructor propounding questions to his pupils (note "His answers"), who in turn were encouraged to ask all manner of counter-questions' (Easton).

And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist 49
ye not that I must be in my Father's house? And they 50
understood not the saying which he spake unto them. And 51
he went down with them, and came to Nazareth; and he was
subject unto them: and his mother kept all *these* sayings in
her heart.

And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour 52
with God and men.

49. We may well agree with Warschauer: 'The form of His answer to Mary's reproach was probably something much simpler and more boyish' than this (p. 29) (cp. the words quoted in the third paragraph of the note on *v.* 40 above), especially if Luke intends a contrast between *my Father* here (God) and *thy father* (Joseph) in *v.* 48, a contrast quite out of place on the lips of the real Jesus.

50. It seems clear that this verse is inconsistent with a presumption of the story of the Annunciation and Miraculous Conception: unless indeed it is, as Easton describes it, 'simply conventional'—added, that is to say, as not infrequently in the case of the disciples, to mark the dullness and bewilderment of humanity before the Divine. It is instructive to notice the straits to which some orthodox commentators are driven in their determination to justify the verse—that Mary and Joseph did not understand the full theological significance of Jesus' use of 'Father'!

51. *and his mother etc.* Cp. *v.* 19 note above.

52. A variation of 1 Sam. ii. 26: 'And the child Samuel grew on, and was in favour both with the Lord, and also with men.'

It may not be out of place to suggest here that traces of Jesus' boyhood experiences may be rightly looked for in His teaching. Such parables as that of the patch on the garment (v. 36 f.) and the lost piece of silver (xv. 8 f.), testify to the humble circles in which His early life was passed: while His comparison of John, Himself and the Jews to children playing at weddings or funerals in the streets is perhaps a glimpse of His own memories of Nazareth (vii. 31 f.). (Cp. T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History*, chap. II.)

Warschauer suggests that the revolt of Judas (Acts v. 37), which took place at the time of Quirinius' census in A.D. 6–7, may have 'left a deep mark on His mind in its most impressionable period.' (Jesus would be between 10 and 15 at the time.) 'The fires of the rebellion were extinguished in blood; but while the conflagration lasted it burned very fiercely, and even in quiet Nazareth the flames and smoke must have been visible. Though this rising was not Messianic in character, it could not but intensify those longings for the promised national Emancipator which played so great a part in contemporary Jewish life; for the census was the outward expression of the hated Roman domination, and for loyal—or fanatical—Jews its payment was an act of apostasy from God....It may well have been the recollection of this ineffectual rebellion, and the pitiful fate of those

3 Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituræa and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of

who took part in it, which caused our Lord in later years to view with distrust that military conception of the Messiahship which for most of His countrymen was the only one' (p. 30).

III. 1–20. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Mark i. 1–8; Matthew iii. 1–12

1–2. The date. This elaborate date may be regarded as characteristic of Luke in two ways. First, his desire for historical accuracy: cp. the use of accurate historical titles and expressions in the Acts which modern research has revealed. Secondly, what has usually been termed his 'universality': i.e. his recognition of Jesus as the Saviour of *all* nations, and his appreciation of the world-wide consequences of the events he is here beginning to tell. Thus he starts the history of Jesus' Ministry by bringing it into touch with the nations—Rome, Palestine, Judaea—whose fortunes Jesus' coming was so profoundly to affect. It is not his fault that the result to us is not a very accurate date. The method of dating by 'synchronisms' was common in the ancient world. Cp. Thuc. II. 2.

It has already been suggested that for chapters i and ii Luke was dependent on a separate written source. Streeter says of this date: 'This surely reads...as if it was originally written as the opening section of a book' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 209). On his theory of 'Proto-Luke' this verse would be the beginning of the first edition of Luke.

1. *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.* Augustus died in A.D. 14. The fifteenth year of Tiberius would naturally therefore be A.D. 29. For the last two or three years however of Augustus' life, Tiberius was associated with him in his rule (Suet. *Tib.* XXI; Tac. *Ann.* I. 3. 3). It is therefore possible that this date should be calculated from A.D. 11 or 12, which would give 26 or 27 as the year intended. The point affects both the general chronology of Jesus' life and Luke's historical accuracy: but it cannot be determined with certainty. The later date is much the most probable interpretation of what Luke says here, but in that case, allowing for a two years' Ministry, the Crucifixion could not have been before 31 or 32. Many scholars agree in placing the Crucifixion in 29, in which case the earlier date will have to be adopted here, or Luke's accuracy sacrificed. It is just possible that Luke thought of Jesus' Ministry as occupying only one year or even a few months. In any case Christian apologetic is no longer concerned to maintain that the Evangelists did not make mistakes. Either date will agree well enough with his statement in iii. 23 that Jesus was about 30 when He began to teach, if Jesus was born before Herod died in 4 B.C.

Abilene, in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the 2
word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the
wilderness. And he came into all the region round about 3
Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission

The difficulties of N.T. chronology can be well seen from C. H. Turner's article 'The Chronology of the New Testament' in *HDB*: or the article 'The Chronology of the New Testament' in *Peake's Commentary*.

Pilate was procurator of Judaea from A.D. 26 to 36. *Herod* Antipas, son of Herod the Great and Malthace, ruled Galilee from 4 B.C. to A.D. 39, when he was banished. The term 'tetrarch' means governor of a fourth part: i.e. a quarter of Herod the Great's dominions.

Philip, son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, reigned 4 B.C.–A.D. 33. Josephus gives as his kingdom Trachonitis, Batanea, Gaulonitis, Hauran and Panias and does not mention Ituraea. But Luke's expression here—'the Ituraea and Trachonitis country'—is too vague for him to be accused of inaccuracy, and may well be equivalent to Josephus' list. Trachonitis means 'rocky and rough country' and takes its name from its nature.

Luke has here been charged with a serious mistake in chronology because the only *Lysanias* whom Josephus mentions as tetrarch of Abilene lived in the time of Antony and Cleopatra—35 B.C. or so. Streeter suggests that if the Lucan writings were first circulated at Rome Luke may have heard Josephus lecture there and have mixed up his notes (*The Four Gospels*, p. 557). But there is no reason why Luke should not be referring to another later Lysanias of Abilene: and indeed an inscription (Corp. Inscr. Gr. 4521) appears to shew that such a person existed in the time of Tiberius. [For a full treatment of the point see Creed, p. 307 f.] Abila is north of Damascus.

2. *in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas.* A strange combination of names, for Annas was high-priest from A.D. 6 to 15, Caiaphas alone A.D. 18–36. But (*a*) the high-priesthood appears to have been regarded by the Jews as a life office in spite of official deposition, (*b*) Annas was a man of great power and influence, and Caiaphas was his son-in-law. It is not therefore surprising that Annas should have continued in power in spite of Caiaphas' official appointment, and that Luke should have described them as joint holders of the office. Cp. John xviii. 13, 14; Acts iv. 6. It is quite possible, however, that Luke's information about the high-priesthood was not accurate.

the word of God came. Cp. Jer. i. 2. This is the regular O.T. phrase for inspiration from God. No doubt Luke uses the words intentionally to describe one who was the successor of the O.T. prophets.

wilderness. By this is meant the barren country between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea—Jeshimon of the O.T.

3. *preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins.* [Luke here uses exactly the same phrase as Mark. But no doubt an account of John's Preaching, and Jesus' Baptism and Temptation, stood in Q as well as Mark, for Luke's similarities to Matthew are far more

of sins; as it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet,

The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
Make his paths straight.
Every valley shall be filled,
And every mountain and hill shall be brought low;
And the crooked shall become straight,
And the rough ways smooth;
And all flesh shall see the salvation of God.

He said therefore to the multitudes that went out to be baptized of him, Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that

striking than his agreements with Mark.] John gives a new meaning to the common Jewish rite of ceremonial washing as a ceremony of preparation for the coming of the Messiah whom he proclaims to them. It is to be the symbol of repentance—'the change of mind,' 'new outlook on life' which alone could fit a man for entry into the Messiah's kingdom. It is much more than the modern use of the word 'repent' implies—mere sorrow for past wrong.

4. Isa. xl. 3 f. The prophet describes the preparation of a perfect road through the desert over which the exiles from Babylon shall return to Jerusalem in triumph, the kind of road prepared for Oriental kings. Mark and Matthew quote the first verse only with its apt description for John. Luke adds the two next verses in order to include the last phrase, '*all flesh* shall see the salvation of God,' which suits so well the main idea of his Gospel—Jesus the Saviour of all men.

7–9. 'You brood of snakes, who has warned you to flee from the Messiah's wrath that is coming? Surface repentance is no use: if your change of mind is sincere it must lead to change of action. Do not think your descent from Abraham will necessarily help you. It is not a question of racial privilege but of character: and God would rather have a good stone than a bad Jew. The time is short; the fruit-grower is going round his orchard axe in hand: no tree will be safe merely because of its kind. If it is a good tree—of whatever kind—he will leave it; if bad he will cut it down.' This passage is from Q. Matthew and Luke agree almost word for word.

7. *He said.* Imperfect. A short summary of John's characteristic preaching.

Ye offspring of vipers. 'Sons, not of Abraham, but of snakes.' The comparison is found in O.T. to illustrate hypocrisy (Ps. lviii. 4. cxl. 3). Perhaps John is here thinking of the snakes (they would be rabbits in England!) that rush for safety out of a field of corn as the corn is cut down.

God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.
And even now is the axe also laid unto the root of the trees: 9
every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn
down, and cast into the fire. And the multitudes asked him, 10
saying, What then must we do? And he answered and said 11
unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him
that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise.
And there came also publicans to be baptized, and they said 12
unto him, Master, what must we do? And he said unto them, 13
Extort no more than that which is appointed you. And 14
soldiers also asked him, saying, And we, what must we do?
And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither exact
anything wrongfully; and be content with your wages.

8. *of these stones.* It is suggested that there is a play upon two Aramaic words, *banim*, 'children' and *abanim*, 'stones.'

10–14. These verses—which do not, apparently, come from Q—are peculiar to Luke. If they are historical, they shew that John gave the people practical advice about matters of conduct as well as warnings of the need for change. He urges kindness and fair dealing between man and man: and his teaching here comes very near that of Jesus in idea, though its motive of desire to avoid punishment is lower than Jesus' lofty conception of the brotherhood of men as sons of God.

11. *two coats*: i.e. one on and one in reserve: he is to give his spare one to 'him that hath none.'

12. *publicans*: these were the subordinate tax-collectors—natives of Palestine—employed by the contractors (*publicani*) to whom the Roman government handed over the collection of the taxes. The Greek word means strictly 'buyers of taxes'=*publicani*. But in the N.T. it is always used as equivalent to *portitores*, 'those who *collected* the taxes' for the *publicani*, or for the government directly, where *publicani* were no longer employed. They were despised and treated as outcasts by the Jews. Professor Haverfield (*Peake's Commentary*, art. 'Roman Empire in the First Century') says: 'The hatred felt for them by the Jews seems to have been caused not so much by the heaviness of the taxes, nor even by their occasional rapacity, as by the strong Jewish feeling against any tax save that payable to the Temple for the needs of the Jewish national religion.' In the early empire at any rate the system of taxation seems to have been fairly administered. But the intense loyalty of the Jews, and of the Pharisees in particular, to the theocracy had been deeply outraged by the Roman rule: and the tax and its collectors stood for the usurping power. [For the details of this rather complicated subject see an interesting section, 'The *telonai* in the Gospels,' of an article by Sir W. Ramsay on 'Roads and Travel in N.T.,' Section v (*HDB*, Extra Vol. p. 394 f.).]

14. *soldiers.* Various suggestions have been made as to who these

15 And as the people were in expectation, and all men reasoned
in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the
16 Christ; John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize
you with water; but there cometh he that is mightier than I,
the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he
17 shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and *with* fire: whose
fan is in his hand, throughly to cleanse his threshing-floor,
and to gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he
will burn up with unquenchable fire.
18 With many other exhortations therefore preached he good
19 tidings unto the people; but Herod the tetrarch, being
reproved by him for Herodias his brother's wife, and for all

'men on military service' were. But the phrase is too vague to be precisely defined.

16. *with the Holy Ghost and with fire.* Matthew and Luke agree in adding 'and with fire,' which therefore stood in Q. The meaning may either refer to the purifying effect of fire or to its destructive element, as in the next verse. Streeter suggests that in Q the contrast was between John's baptism with water and the Messiah's with fire: and that Matthew and Luke combined this with Mark's contrast between baptism by water and by the Spirit. It is futile to find any reference to Pentecost or Christian persecutions.

17. Matthew and Luke, from Q. In threshing, the corn and chaff were thrown up into the wind by a wooden shovel ('fan') so as to be separated from one another. The Messiah's shovel is in his hand, ready for use.

19–20. Luke inserts here a notice of the imprisonment of John which Matthew and Mark tell of later together with his death (Matt. xiv. 3–5, Mark vi. 17–20). Luke does not wish to describe this at length, and his editorial sense prompts him to complete his account of John's work by a reference to its end.

At this point it is worth while to quote what the first-century Jewish historian Josephus says of John. 'John was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another and piety toward God, and so come to baptism. For baptism would be acceptable to God if they used it, not for the pardon of certain sins, but for the purification of the body, provided that the soul had been thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness.... Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise rebellion (for they seemed to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late' (*Antiquities*, XVIII. 5: published A.D. 93).

It will be seen that what Josephus says of John differs from the account given by the Gospels in two main points. (1) Josephus omits the eschatological element in John's teaching, the prophecy of divine judgment and of the 'mightier one' to come; and (2) he represents

the evil things which Herod had done, added yet this above 20
all, that he shut up John in prison.

Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, 21
that, Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the
heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a 22
bodily form, as a dove, upon him, and a voice came out of
heaven, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.

John as recommending baptism as an end in itself concerned with purification of the body rather than as a sign of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. It seems probable that the account given by the Gospels is substantially correct, and that Josephus' version arose from the fact that he was writing for an educated Gentile public (he wrote in Greek) who would not appreciate apocalyptic and Messianic judgment. (For a full discussion see *B. of C.* I, p. 101 f.; Creed, p. 309 f.)

20. *in prison.* Josephus says this was at Machaerus on the east of the Dead Sea.

21–22. JESUS' BAPTISM

Mark i. 9–11; Matthew iii. 13–17

21. *the heaven was opened...the Holy Ghost descended* (22). Mark has 'he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit...descending.' Matthew has 'the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending.' It is interesting to notice the difference between these versions. Mark's gives the impression—no doubt the true one, for there is no sign in the Synoptists of immediate acknowledgment of Jesus as Messiah after His Baptism—that the opening of the heavens and descent of the Spirit was seen by Jesus only. Matthew represents the opening of the heavens more generally, the Spirit's descent still a vision seen by Jesus. Luke's verbs are both general, and the impression of a public demonstration is increased by *in a bodily form* which follows. No doubt the Q account represented the vision as general: Matthew combines Mark and Q, Luke accepts Q and (perhaps) develops it further himself.

22. *in a bodily form.* By this phrase—peculiar to his narrative—Luke emphasises the material nature, as he conceived it, of the apparition. Both in the Gospel and in Acts Luke frequently describes supernatural appearances in objective terms.

Thou art...pleased. So also Matthew and Mark. Here some MSS read 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee,' Ps. ii. 7. Streeter says: 'On grounds of internal probability this reading is clearly to be preferred for two reasons: (*a*) The tendency of scribal alterations would be to make the text of Luke agree with Matthew and Mark; with this reading, on the contrary, there is a discrepancy between the Gospels. (*b*) The Lucan reading could readily be quoted in favour of the view, afterwards regarded as heretical, that Christ only became the Son of God at His Baptism. Once, therefore, the assimilation with the other Gospels had been made in any MS, it would be preferred as more orthodox, and would rapidly be taken up into other texts' (*The*

23 And Jesus himself, when he began *to teach*, was about thirty years of age, being the son (as was supposed) of

Four Gospels, p. 143). Further (p. 188): 'If Luke wrote this, and that with Mark in front of him, it must have been because it stood in his other source,' i.e. Q.

To the modern mind this reading in Luke may well serve as the key to the interpretation of the Baptism of Jesus in spite of the stigma of heresy which it later incurred. If the story of His visit to Jerusalem with His parents is to be accepted as historical, we can see there, as has been suggested in the notes on the passage (ii. 40 f.), a glimpse of the growth in Jesus of what to-day we should call 'a sense of vocation.' He felt that His future life was to be connected somehow with the religion of His country. During the silent years between that incident and His Baptism this idea of His future was no doubt developing in His mind. He comes with many others of His countrymen to listen to the new prophet who was proclaiming that Messiah was near, and is baptised, like the rest. [There is no need to follow Matthew's example (iii. 14, 15), and to supply artificial reasons for Jesus' baptism. It was as natural an act as that of any other of those whom John baptised: nor need one imagine that any idea of His sinlessness was at this time in the mind of Jesus or of anyone else.] At His Baptism the spirit of Jesus came into touch with the Spirit of God; there came to Him the conviction that God had set Him in an unique relationship to Himself, had chosen Him for a special purpose to carry out a mission in the world.

It is perhaps as well, even to-day, to point out that one need not suppose that the Spirit appeared in material form or that a supernatural voice was actually heard. The emphasis which the thought of our own day lays upon the spiritual nature of God will account for the change of outlook on the channels of communication between God and man. That these channels should be material seemed entirely appropriate to the generation which produced the Gospels.

Either the narrative of this experience—as well as of the Temptation that follows—comes from Jesus Himself, told in a symbolic form as He Himself visualised it afterwards: or the two stories are 'pictures which believers formed of the beginning of His Mission as Son of God. Such a hypothesis does not involve the conclusion that the pictures were creations of the pure imagination, for (1) there is reason to believe that historically the evangelists are right in connecting the beginning of the Gospel with the baptism of John, and (2) the estimate of the person of Jesus, which the narratives reflect, had its origin in the impression which He made upon His followers before and after His death' (Creed, p. 56).

23–38. JESUS' ANCESTRY

Cp. Matthew i. 1–16

23. (*as was supposed*). It is obvious that if Jesus was only 'supposed' to be the son of Joseph there is no point in giving Joseph's ancestry.

Joseph, the *son* of Heli, the *son* of Matthat, the *son* of Levi, 24
the *son* of Melchi, the *son* of Jannai, the *son* of Joseph, the 25
son of Mattathias, the *son* of Amos, the *son* of Nahum, the
son of Esli, the *son* of Naggai, the *son* of Maath, the *son* of 26
Mattathias, the *son* of Semein, the *son* of Josech, the *son* of
Joda, the *son* of Joanan, the *son* of Rhesa, the *son* of Zerub- 27
babel, the *son* of Shealtiel, the *son* of Neri, the *son* of Melchi, 28
the *son* of Addi, the *son* of Cosam, the *son* of Elmadam, the
son of Er, the *son* of Jesus, the *son* of Eliezer, the *son* of 29
Jorim, the *son* of Matthat, the *son* of Levi, the *son* of Symeon, 30
the *son* of Judas, the *son* of Joseph, the *son* of Jonam, the
son of Eliakim, the *son* of Melea, the *son* of Menna, the *son* 31
of Mattatha, the *son* of Nathan, the *son* of David, the *son* 32
of Jesse, the *son* of Obed, the *son* of Boaz, the *son* of Salmon,
the *son* of Nahshon, the *son* of Amminadab, the *son* of Arni, 33
the *son* of Hezron, the *son* of Perez, the *son* of Judah, the 34
son of Jacob, the *son* of Isaac, the *son* of Abraham, the *son*
of Terah, the *son* of Nahor, the *son* of Serug, the *son* of Reu, 35
the *son* of Peleg, the *son* of Eber, the *son* of Shelah, the *son* 36
of Cainan, the *son* of Arphaxad, the *son* of Shem, the *son* of
Noah, the *son* of Lamech, the *son* of Methuselah, the *son* of 37
Enoch, the *son* of Jared, the *son* of Mahalaleel, the *son* of
Cainan, the *son* of Enos, the *son* of Seth, the *son* of Adam, 38
the *son* of God.

Clearly, therefore, the compiler of the genealogy regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph. This phrase, then, will have been added by Luke himself or by some earlier editor who, like Luke, accepted the story of the Miraculous Conception.

To Jewish readers Jesus' descent from David and Abraham would, of course, have had great importance. The modern reader may justly feel that to him it is Jesus Himself who matters, not His family history. But the following points may be noted with regard to this genealogy as compared with that in Matthew:

(1) Matthew's descends from Abraham to Joseph, Luke's ascends from Joseph to 'Adam, the son of God.' This latter point is in keeping with Luke's universality of outlook.

(2) They agree in the names between Abraham and David. From David to Joseph Matthew gives 25 names, Luke 40: and the only two in which they agree are those of Zerubbabel and Shealtiel.

(3) Even a conservative critic like Plummer admits that the various attempts at reconciliation are 'in no case convincingly successful.' There the matter may well rest. It is such attempts at reconciliation which merit Loisy's scornful phrase 'les subtilités extraordinaires par

4 And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness during

lesquelles on a essayé de mettre d'accord la généalogie de Luc avec celle de Matthieu' (*Luc*, p. 147). The genealogies are independent and incompatible, based on different Jewish traditions.

IV. 1–13. THE TEMPTATION

Mark i. 12–13; Matthew iv. 1–11

This incident stood in both Mark and Q, but the two accounts appear to have been largely different. Mark says simply 'and straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.' From this one would get the impression (1) that the Temptation occurred during the forty days, and not, as in Matthew (and Luke less definitely), at the end of that period; (2) that Jesus did not fast but on the contrary 'angels continued to minister to Him' (the word in the Greek is an imperfect) throughout the time. This passage is an important part of the evidence for the fact that Mark did not use Q. Matthew and Luke take their account from Q, and agree throughout except for verbal differences and in the order of the second and third temptations.

1. *full of the Holy Spirit.* All the Gospels emphasise the connection between the Baptism and the Temptation, though in Luke it is somewhat obscured by the position of the genealogy. It was entirely natural that after His wonderful experience at His Baptism Jesus should want to think things out quietly by Himself. He knew now what His future work was to be: but He had to decide on what principles He was to set about it. It is a mistake to think of the Temptation as an event imposed upon Jesus by God, such as nobody else could ever in any degree have experienced, and with little connection with the rest of His life. Many a man since Jesus' time has felt the need, after a crisis in his life, of a period of quiet in which to think things out. This narrative describes the first and strongest onset of those difficulties which must have continually presented themselves to Jesus during His Ministry. Whether the story owes its origin to what Jesus Himself told, or whether the details have been filled in by early Christians from their own understanding of Jesus, cannot be certainly determined (cp. note on the Baptism above).

during forty days. Commentators compare various O.T. passages to shew that the number forty was connected with fasting and suffering: e.g. the fasts of Moses and Elijah (Deut. ix. 9; 1 Kings xix. 8); the length of the flood (Gen. vii. 4, 12); the maximum number of stripes to be inflicted (Deut. xxv. 3), etc. This may explain the occurrence of the number in the Christian tradition of the Temptation. On the other hand, the number forty is in Hebrew commonly used to denote an indefinite but considerable time, as three is for an indefinite but short time, and seventy for a complete time.

forty days, being tempted of the devil. And he did eat 2
nothing in those days: and when they were completed, he
hungered. And the devil said unto him, If thou art the Son 3
of God, command this stone that it become bread. And 4
Jesus answered unto him, It is written, Man shall not live
by bread alone. And he led him up, and shewed him all the 5

2. *of the devil.* There is no need to suppose the appearance of a personal devil: the story describes a struggle in Jesus' mind. Nor is the passage necessarily evidence for the existence of an individual evil power.

he did eat nothing. Matt. 'when he had fasted.' Luke emphasises the absolute nature of the fast. Matthew's word, which probably stood in Q, does not necessarily mean that Jesus ate nothing at all during this time. It suggests that the struggle going on in His mind was intense enough to make Him disregard physical needs. Mark, as has been shewn above, seems not to know of a fast.

3. In the first temptation the emphasis lies on the word 'if.' It is a temptation of doubt. Jesus reflects upon the experience of His Baptism. He had been certain then of the reality of His commission, but as He thinks it over now, doubts come to Him: 'If thou be the Son of God'—'*If* thou be'—'If.' 'Am I the Messiah?' He can test the matter—He is hungry—shall He try to turn the stones around Him into bread? If He is God's Messiah, He will presumably have miraculous powers.

Then a verse from Deuteronomy comes into His mind: 'It is God's word, not bread only, that is man's food.' The word of God *has* come to Jesus and that must be enough. The Spirit of God has touched Jesus' spirit and cannot be denied: and He thrusts the doubt aside. Professor Peake sums up this temptation thus: 'Reaction follows on the radiant ecstasy of conviction, the critical intellect is tempted to doubt the reality of the experience.' Many a man since has felt, as Jesus felt, how hard it is to cling to ideals or good resolutions—the knowledge of one's best self—in the face of despondency and doubt.

4. *Man shall not live by bread alone*—Matthew completes the quotation (from Deut. viii. 3)—, 'but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'

5. In Matthew the order of the temptations is Bread, Temple, Kingdoms of the World: in Luke Bread, Kingdoms, Temple. It is usually held that Matthew preserves the original order of Q. The order of Matthew certainly leads up to the climax more naturally: and it is possible that Luke may have altered the order from 'geographical' considerations, i.e. to bracket together the temptations of the Bread and the Kingdoms which might both be supposed to occur in the 'desert,' and then to change the scene to Jerusalem for the Temple temptation. In the notes that follow Matthew's order will be regarded as original.

The second and third temptations look forward. Is Jesus to set about His work by performing supernatural exploits or by using political means? (The Temple.) The thought comes into Jesus' mind,

6 kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil
said unto him, To thee will I give all this authority, and the
glory of them: for it hath been delivered unto me; and to
7 whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship
8 before me, it shall all be thine. And Jesus answered and said
unto him, It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy
9 God, and him only shalt thou serve. And he led him to
Jerusalem, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and

'Would not the best way to begin My work be to do some miracle of which the fame would soon spread far and wide, so as to win men to Me?' The Messiah was expected to 'give a sign.' If Jesus threw Himself down from the Temple unhurt surely men would accept Him as Messiah. But the thought is rejected. That is not the way God wants Jesus to win men to Him. Faith that comes only from astonishment or fear is worthless. Men must come to believe in Jesus for what He is, not because they wonder at Him or fear Him. Only faith that came through many difficulties—faith based on a conviction deep down in a man's heart that in Jesus was to be found the fulfilment of all that man's ideals—would be firm and lasting. A true estimate of the place of His miracles in Jesus' life will find this thought present to His mind again and again in the story of His Ministry: the miracles are not His credentials, but works of mercy as His love is touched by suffering.

(The Kingdoms of the World.) Insurgent patriotism—revolt against the Roman masters—was made the characteristic of Messiah by Jewish popular thought. Jesus has to decide whether He is to be that kind of Messiah—encouraging revolt against Rome and urging His people to armed conquest: or is He to teach men that God's weapons are not force but love; and that conquest of evil, not of enemies, should be men's aim? If He took the first course, He might win 'all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them': He must have seen that if He took the second, failure, as men would count failure, was the inevitable result. But He knew that the second course was God's will for Him, and He determined to follow it. 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.' He refuses to 'fall down and worship Satan'—to give in to what He knows is wrong. Continually through His Ministry the hard choice between faithfulness to the will of God and outward success had to be made; for the last time at Gethsemane, when one alternative was the Cross.

The foregoing notes have explained the 'Temptations' as real experiences of Jesus. If, however, the story is regarded as later Christian reflection upon His Ministry, the Temptations will represent false Messianic traits and ideals which Christians felt to be signally absent from the life and character of Jesus. In any case, it is not likely that the idea of His Messiahship was so clearly present in the mind of Jesus, at this early stage, as the story now represents. (See further Appendix I, last section.)

8. Deut. vi. 13.

said unto him, If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence: for it is written,

He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to guard thee:

and,

On their hands they shall bear thee up,
Lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone.

And Jesus answering said unto him, It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

And when the devil had completed every temptation, he departed from him for a season.

And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and a fame went out concerning him through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up:

10. Ps. xci. 11.

12. Deut. vi. 16.

13. *for a season*: perhaps rather, 'until a convenient time.' Possibly Luke is thinking of Jesus' struggle at Gethsemane, when the same temptation was before Him.

14–15. THE RETURN TO GALILEE

Cp. Matt. iv. 12 f.; Mark i. 14

But Luke has hardly any points of verbal agreement with Mark in these two verses, and it is quite possible that he is here following either Q or the source from which the next incident is taken.

14. *a fame.* Presumably this anticipates what follows; or possibly Luke implies some miracles immediately on Jesus' return.

16–30. JESUS AT NAZARETH

Cp. Matt. xiii. 53 f.; Mark vi. 1 f.

Luke has obviously quite a different version of this incident from that of Mark which Matthew follows. He also completely deserts Mark's order by telling the story here as though it were the first act of Jesus' Ministry in Galilee, though from *v.* 23 ('whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum') it is quite clear that it was not. Different reasons have been suggested for this alteration in order. The most probable is that Luke regarded this incident as symbolical of the whole of Jesus' life—His rejection by His own people: the prophet has honour, but not in his own country. [It is possible, indeed, that under the influence of this motive Luke has himself expanded Mark's narrative into what he here records.] His sympathies, as Paul's disciple,

and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the
17 sabbath day, and stood up to read. And there was delivered
unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And he opened
the book, and found the place where it was written,
18 The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the
poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
19 To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.

with the call to the Gentiles have, no doubt, also influenced him. As Elijah and Elisha had been sent to sufferers outside Israel, so it had been with Jesus.

16. Standing to read was the usual custom. 'The lectern was close to the front seats where those who were most likely to be called upon to read commonly sat. A lesson from the Law was read first and then one from the Prophets. After the lesson had been read it was interpreted into Aramaic (Neh. viii. 8) or into Greek in places where Greek was commonly spoken....Then followed the exposition or sermon. The reader, interpreter and preacher might be one, two, or three persons....Any member of the congregation might discharge these duties; probably those who were competent discharged them in turn at the invitation of the "ruler of the synagogue" (Acts xiii. 15)' (Plummer).

17. *found the place.* Either the Jewish lesson for the day (if there was any strict cycle of lessons at Jesus' time) or a passage which Jesus Himself chose.

18–19. Isa. lxi. 1–2. In Isaiah the reference is to the release and return of those in captivity.

18. *to preach...to the poor.* McNeile on Matt. v. 3 says: '"poor" represents a Hebrew word which does not mean "lacking wealth" or "humble," but describes the pious in Israel, for the most part literally poor, whom the worldly rich despised and persecuted. It is frequent in the Psalter.' Cp. vii. 22, where 'the good news to the poor' is strikingly placed by Jesus Himself as the climax of His work—above even raising from the dead. It is a phrase which goes to the very heart of Jesus' Ministry. To the 'poor' of this time Judaism as a whole—there were many striking exceptions—with its unattainable standard of ritual innocence and its gloomy apocalyptic imagery, gave little hope. Jesus' message told them that a man could find salvation, not in legal righteousness, but in growth of character and right use of the opportunities that God gave him. To the 'poor' it was indeed 'good news.'

To set at liberty them that are bruised. This phrase is from Isa. lviii. 6, not lxi.

And he closed the book, and gave it back to the attendant, 20
and sat down: and the eyes of all in the synagogue were
fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, To-day 21
hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears. And all bare 22
him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which
proceeded out of his mouth: and they said, Is not this
Joseph's son? And he said unto them, Doubtless ye will say 23
unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we

20. *the attendant.* The *chazzan* whose duty it was to get out and replace the Scriptures.

22. *bare him witness*: i.e. bore witness to the truth of what they had heard of Him. *words of grace*: 'winning words.'

This verse reads somewhat awkwardly. '*Is not this Joseph's son?*' is naturally interpreted (as in Mark and Matthew) as an ill-natured criticism of Jesus' presumption. They knew Him too well—'A carpenter, Joseph's son, Messiah! Ridiculous.' In that case the change from admiration to contempt seems too sudden. It has therefore been suggested that 'Is not this Joseph's son?' should be understood here as a compliment—an added ground for admiration. This is artificial. It is possible that Luke or his source has here combined two incidents: *v.* 16 to 'his mouth' in *v.* 22; and '(and) they said' in *v.* 22 to *v.* 30: the first an incident at Nazareth peculiar to himself; the second an altered and amplified version of the incident which Mark and Matthew describe. Or the awkwardness may simply be due to Luke's didactic expansion of Mark.

Is not this Joseph's son? Mark 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? And are not his sisters here with us?' Matthew similarly except 'is not this the carpenter's *son*?' If the three versions of the questions have a common origin, the passage is a good illustration of alteration due to motives of doctrine or reverence. Mark's version reads most naturally under the circumstances. Jesus' fellow-townsmen were scornful; familiarity had bred contempt. He was the carpenter who had mended their chairs and tables, and it seemed ludicrous to think of Him as Messiah. The other versions seem reluctant to think of Jesus as a carpenter—plying a human trade; they feel that it is not quite reverent or dignified. So one calls Him the carpenter's son, and the other removes the reference to carpentry altogether.

To the unprejudiced reader the passage, together with the parallels in Mark and Matthew, appears to afford evidence of two facts, both of which have been somewhat unscrupulously evaded in the interests of particular doctrinal presuppositions: (1) That the story of the Miraculous Conception of Jesus was not known at this time (cp. Mark iii. 21). (2) That the brothers and sisters of Jesus were also sons of Mary and Joseph. (Cp. note on viii. 19 below.)

23. *Physician, heal thyself.* It is not easy to see the application of this proverb here. (1) 'You have worked miracles elsewhere: why do

have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own
24 country. And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is
25 acceptable in his own country. But of a truth I say unto
you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah,
when the heaven was shut up three years and six months,
26 when there came a great famine over all the land; and unto
none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath, in the
27 land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And there
were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet;
and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian.
28 And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue, as they
29 heard these things; and they rose up, and cast him forth out
of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon
their city was built, that they might throw him down head-
30 long. But he passing through the midst of them went his
way.

you not help your own countrymen?' To this some object that 'thyself' cannot include Jesus' fellow-townspeople: and therefore suggest that the meaning is (2) 'Before you can help others, you must shew your own credentials'; 'If you are Messiah, why do you not win our belief by working miracles?' But this is over-subtle: and the first explanation may stand—for want of a better.

done at Capernaum. Cp. note at beginning of this section. By his alteration of the order of events Luke has placed this incident before the miracles at Capernaum to which this verse refers.

25–30. These verses are peculiar to Luke. The argument in *vv.* 25–27 is that as Elijah's and Elisha's benefits were bestowed upon those outside Israel, so now Jesus will turn to those outside His own people.

25. *three years and six months.* For the whole passage cp. 1 Kings xvii–xviii. According to Kings the period was three years: but James v. 17 says three and a half, following, as this passage does, the usual Jewish tradition on the point. The difference is explained by the fact that the number $3\frac{1}{2}$ (which, as half of seven, has a special religious significance) has become the traditional number of years for the duration of periods of calamity. (Cp. Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7; Rev. xi. 2–3, 6–14, xiii. 5; Plummer, *ad loc.*)

27. 2 Kings v.

29. Various attempts have been made to identify the spot. Nazareth stands on the side of a hill and there is said to be a 'brow' 30 or 40 feet high overhanging the town. If this attempt to murder Jesus is historical, this may be the spot described.

30. To the evangelist Jesus' escape clearly appeared to be miraculous. Commentators have suggested that He 'awed them with a look,' and left them. To Luke the incident is symbolical of Jesus' ultimate victory in spite of the enmity of His foes.

And he came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee. And 31
he was teaching them on the sabbath day: and they were 32
astonished at his teaching; for his word was with authority.
And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit 33

31–44. HEALINGS AT CAPERNAUM

Cp. Mark i. 21–39

31. Luke here takes up Mark's narrative, which he follows until vi. 19, except that he inserts the story of the Call of Peter at the beginning of chapter v.

he came down. Nazareth is on a hill, 600 feet up: Capernaum on the shore of the sea of Galilee.

32. It was the 'freshness' of Jesus' teaching that struck the people most. The scribes who were the regular religious teachers would base their teaching on what past teachers had said—the traditions that had come down to them. Jesus broke away from tradition, judged everything on its own merits, and spoke out boldly what He Himself felt.

It may be well to emphasise here a fact that is often forgotten, that Jesus began His work inside Judaism, and did not leave it till He was forced to do so. He begins teaching naturally in the synagogues, and continues to teach there until the opposition of the Pharisees forces Him to use other methods (Mark iii. 6 f.). It was the same with the early Church. The disciples continued to take part in the Temple services (Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, etc.) until persecution prevented it.

33. *a spirit of an unclean devil.* Mark 'with an unclean spirit.' What Luke meant exactly by the composite phrase it is difficult to understand. The genitive may be of 'definition,' i.e. 'a spirit consisting in an unclean demon': 'Luke distinguishes the spirit from the organism in which it works, and the special form of its manifestation; cp. xiii. 11, "a spirit of infirmity," and Acts xvi. 16, "a spirit of divination"' (Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, II, p. 279).

With regard to the possession by evil spirits and the cure of those so possessed, which appears so prominently in our Gospels, two facts at least seem clear: (1) Like other ancient peoples the Jews believed that madness, and some diseases too, were the result of demonic possession. (2) Jesus shared that belief. Reluctance to admit that Jesus was limited in matters of human knowledge implies failure to recognise the completeness and reality of His humanity. 'Belief in the infallibility of Jesus is the modern form of Docetism' (H. G. Wood, *Peake's Commentary*, p. 663). In medical, scientific and literary matters Jesus shared the knowledge of His contemporaries. The fact that Jesus, in a case of this kind, shared the belief of the man possessed and of the bystanders with regard to the nature of the possession does not affect the reality or possibility of the cure. Quite obviously, the power of Jesus over those who were regarded as 'possessed' made a deep impression upon those who knew Him. The power of the mind over the body is becoming more and more fully established as science advances: and the success of faith-healing and suggestion serves at least to shew

34 of an unclean devil; and he cried out with a loud voice, Ah!
what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art
thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the
35 Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy
peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown
him down in the midst, he came out of him, having done
36 him no hurt. And amazement came upon all, and they spake
together, one with another, saying, What is this word? for
with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits,
37 and they come out. And there went forth a rumour con-
cerning him into every place of the region round about.
38 And he rose up from the synagogue, and entered into the

the lines along which Jesus must have worked. If a doctor's strong personality can cure a diseased mind, it is not surprising that One whose personality was uniquely strong should have done the same. 'It was Jesus' own trust in God, and His own confidence in the victory of good over evil, that He passed on to others. They caught it from Him. He was able to drive out the fear by which they were possessed and bring back calm and hope to their minds, and so to create or restore the conditions favourable to the health of their bodies.' [The quotation is from an excellent discussion of the miracles of Jesus in a little book by Professor J. F. Bethune-Baker, *Early Traditions about Jesus* (Part III of *The Rise of the Christian Church*, Vol. I). The book is admirable as a simple summary of the main facts of Jesus' life and teaching.]

34. The recognition of Jesus as Messiah by the demoniac, if historical, suggests that Jesus had been in some degree already accepted as Messiah. An early acceptance and subsequent falling away is implied in the Fourth Gospel (John vi. 66 f.). It is more probable, however, either that this verse is an interpretation of the demoniac's inarticulate cries: or that Mark's own conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus, or that of an earlier generation, has prompted the putting of an acknowledgment of it, at the outset of Jesus' Ministry, into the demoniac's mouth. Early Christians would regard 'demoniac testimony to Christ's nature as highly important, for demons had supernatural knowledge' (Easton). The Synoptic narrative as a whole gives the impression that there was no general recognition of Jesus as Messiah before Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi.

35. *Hold thy peace.* Lit. 'be muzzled.' Cp. Mark iv. 39; Matt. xxii. 12.

having done him no hurt. Luke adds the phrase to heighten the miracle.

38. Luke has omitted the account of the call of the first disciples which Mark gives (i. 16–20), because he has an independent account of his own to give later (v. 1–11). Thus Simon is introduced here without explanation or comment.

house of Simon. And Simon's wife's mother was holden with
a great fever; and they besought him for her. And he stood 39
over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and imme-
diately she rose up and ministered unto them.

And when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick 40
with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his
hands on every one of them, and healed them. And devils 41
also came out from many, crying out, and saying, Thou art
the Son of God. And rebuking them, he suffered them not
to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ.

And when it was day, he came out and went into a desert 42
place: and the multitudes sought after him, and came unto
him, and would have stayed him, that he should not go from
them. But he said unto them, I must preach the good tidings 43
of the kingdom of God to the other cities also: for therefore
was I sent.

39. Luke heightens the miracle again by substituting *rebuked the fever* for Mark's simple 'raised her up'; and adding *immediately* in the last phrase.

40. The day was a sabbath: thus it was not until it ended at sunset that burdens could be carried and the sick brought to Jesus. Mark here has the double phrase 'at even, when the sun did set'; it is interesting to see how Matthew (viii. 16) selects one half ('when even was come'), Luke the other (*when the sun was setting*), in their abbreviation of Mark.

on every one of them. Luke emphasises the individual attention that Jesus gives.

43. Mark: 'Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for for this I came forth.' This is important evidence —recorded here by Mark in direct contrast to the impression that one would get from his Gospel as a whole, and such that no Christian would have invented it—for Jesus' own view of His work. Jesus Himself regarded teaching as the main purpose of His life. Here He deliberately rejects the popularity and fame He is winning by His healings, and takes up His teaching work in another town. Mark's account of how Jesus went out early in the morning by Himself and prayed, before the rush to be healed should begin again, suggests that the decision was not easy.

The conception of the 'rule of God' on earth—for this, rather than 'kingdom of God,' is what the Aramaic phrase that Jesus used would have meant—grew out of the theocracy of the O.T.; but by the time of Jesus, as a result of the struggle during the last two centuries B.C. between Judaism and the world outside, it had taken to itself new ideas. Dr Vernon Bartlet (*Peake's Commentary*, art. 'Religious Background of N.T. writings') sums up these ideas as follows: 'The true

44 And he was preaching in the synagogues of Galilee.
5 Now it came to pass, while the multitude pressed upon

Sovereignty of the God of Israel—the kingdom of (the God of) heaven on earth, first in Israel and then through Israel over all; a grand assize or final judgment on earth, to usher in the kingdom; and as implied in this, a resurrection of the dead, at least of the righteous...; and finally, as means and crown of all this according to general expectation, the Messiah or Divinely anointed One in human form, in whom God's presence and power should be focussed and made manifest, as in a Viceregent or kingly Son.' How these main ideas were elaborated can be seen from the Jewish Apocalyptic writings (see Appendix I), with their imaginative pictures of the catastrophes which should attend the coming of Messiah, the destruction of the heathen, and the establishment of the kingdom.

Jesus took over these ideas, but altered them. He pictured the kingdom as a kingdom of hearts, not of armies. The rule of God on earth would come through the spread of the love of God in men's hearts, not through the destruction of sinners; and the qualification for entry into the kingdom was not to be unreasoning faithfulness to the Law, but the possession of the deepest moral virtues of the character of God Himself. Thus the kingdom was at the same time present and future: present, in so far as anywhere men loved God as sons should love their Father, and acted towards one another as brothers,—future, because it would not be complete until all men were fit to enter it. Sooner or later, too, there came into Jesus' mind the conviction that the kingdom would come through His own death for it.

44. Some MSS here read *Galilee*; others 'Judaea.' Mark and Matthew speak of Galilee. Judaea appears to be the true reading, 'Galilee' being a correction due to assimilation with Mark and Matthew. It has been argued that Luke implies here a strictly 'Judaean' ministry—which would agree with the Fourth Gospel's view: but Luke frequently uses Judaea in the sense of the whole country of the Jews, i.e. Palestine (cp. vii. 17, xxiii. 5: also Acts), and this is no doubt the sense here.

V. 1–11. THE CALL OF PETER AND THE MARVELLOUS CATCH OF FISH

Cp. Mark i. 16–20; Matthew iv. 18–22: also John xxi. 1–11

In this incident Luke is, with possibly two or three small exceptions, independent of Mark: Mark's narrative is an account of the call of two pairs of disciples, Peter and Andrew, and James and John; Luke's account at first mentions Peter only, and introduces James and John as a kind of afterthought, omitting Andrew altogether, and adding the miraculous draught of fish. It is to some extent parallel to the appearance of Jesus after the Resurrection, and the catch of fish, narrated in John xxi.

Various opinions have been held with regard to the origin of Luke's

him and heard the word of God, that he was standing by the
lake of Gennesaret; and he saw two boats standing by the 2
lake: but the fishermen had gone out of them, and were
washing their nets. And he entered into one of the boats, 3
which was Simon's, and asked him to put out a little from
the land. And he sat down and taught the multitudes out
of the boat. And when he had left speaking, he said unto 4
Simon, Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a
draught. And Simon answered and said, Master, we toiled 5
all night, and took nothing: but at thy word I will let down
the nets. And when they had this done, they inclosed a great 6
multitude of fishes; and their nets were breaking; and they 7
beckoned unto their partners in the other boat, that they
should come and help them. And they came, and filled both
the boats, so that they began to sink. But Simon Peter, 8

story: (1) That it is a combination, by Luke or an earlier hand, of the accounts in Mark and John. (2) That it is an allegory symbolical of events in the early Church. Thus 'the deep water is the Gentile world, but Peter, though the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews had been a failure, is reluctant to enter on a wider field. At last he does so and the success is so great that others (Paul? Barnabas?) have to be called into help.' Andrew, whom Mark mentions as 'called' with Peter, is left out, because nothing is heard of him later. James and John, who become prominent in the Church, are included. (3) That it is a tradition comparable to some of the stories about Peter found in Matthew (coin in fish's mouth; walking on the water), which Luke derived from an oral source.

In any case, it can hardly be doubted that the incident had, to Luke, a clear symbolic value (like his account of the visit to Nazareth above). Peter's commission to be a 'fisher of men,' and the catch that follows, pictures his position and success as the leader of the early Church.

1. *the lake of Gennesaret.* Luke's accurate description of it as a 'lake' is not used elsewhere in the N.T. Luke never calls it a 'sea.' In the O.T. it is called the 'sea of Chinnereth.' It is seven miles across at its widest, thirteen at its longest. It is described as 'a beautiful sheet of water set deep in a vast basin amongst the hills.' It is 600 feet below sea level. At Jesus' time it was surrounded by many flourishing towns and villages, and large numbers of fishing vessels sailed over it. 'Now it is often difficult to find a single crazy boat at Tiberias, and the Arabs fish mainly by throwing poisoned breadcrumbs into the water near the shore': while 'the only inhabited places on the western shores of the lake are the crumbling, dirty, earthquake-shaken town of Tiberias and the mud village of *El Mejdel*, the ancient Magdala' (Farrar (1890), *ad loc.*).

8–10. Commentators defend these verses as the expression of Peter's awe at the miracle. 'Peter is overwhelmed by this token of the super-

when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart
9 from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was amazed,
and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which
10 they had taken; and so were also James and John, sons of
Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said
unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.
11 And when they had brought their boats to land, they left all,
and followed him.

12 And it came to pass, while he was in one of the cities;
behold, a man full of leprosy: and when he saw Jesus, he fell
on his face, and besought him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt,
13 thou canst make me clean. And he stretched forth his hand,
and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean. And

human' (Lonsdale Ragg); 'the voice of conscience awakened by the presence of something superhuman in Jesus' (Adeney); 'a new sense of his own sinfulness and Christ's holiness' (Plummer). How artificial such explanations sound—and how far from the warm human friendship which bound together Jesus and the Twelve! Loisy says sarcastically of Jesus' answer: 'Ainsi parlent les êtres surnaturels aux humains qu'ils favorisent de leurs apparitions et qui sont effrayés de leur approche.' One cannot help feeling how distasteful such a story, with its motif of wonder intended to convince the future apostles, might have been to Jesus Himself.

11. However legendary Luke's setting, the fact remains—they left all and followed Him. No doubt Jesus knew them before this: Peter was His host at Capernaum. But incidents of this kind, although familiarity has blunted their effect to the average reader, shew how strong must have been the power of Jesus' personality, and how magnetic His influence. They followed because they felt that the only thing that mattered was to be with Jesus.

12–16. A LEPER HEALED

Mark i. 40–45; Matthew viii. 2–4

12. *full of leprosy.* Matthew, Mark simply 'a leper.' Luke emphasises the badness of the case. It appears that the leprosy of the Bible is not the modern disease known by that name (elephantiasis, which causes loss of parts of the body), but a skin disease due to dirt. Cp. xvii. 12 note. Lepers were complete outcasts. They were forbidden to enter towns through fear of infection, and had to give warning of their approach by the cry 'Unclean! unclean!' Apparently the incident happens in a town in public, but it is hard to account for the man's presence there. A phrase used by Mark (Mark i. 43), 'sent him out,' perhaps suggests that the man had come to Jesus in a house in a village. Otherwise one would imagine that the man met Jesus on the road.

13. *touched him.* An action characteristic of Jesus, in disregard for

straightway the leprosy departed from him. And he charged 14
him to tell no man: but go thy way, and shew thyself to the
priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses com-
manded, for a testimony unto them. But so much the more 15
went abroad the report concerning him: and great multitudes
came together to hear, and to be healed of their infirmities.
But he withdrew himself in the deserts, and prayed. 16

the prohibitions of the ceremonial law where the Law of Love demanded action.

At this point two interesting facts in the text of Mark should be noticed, both omitted by Luke and Matthew: (1) Before 'he stretched forth his hand' Mark has 'being moved with compassion' (some MSS read 'being angry'); (2) after the cure Mark adds 'and he sternly charged him and sent him out.' Matthew and Luke very often omit or soften down expressions attributing strong emotion to Jesus: their omission of these two details therefore needs no special explanation, especially if in the first case 'being angry' is the true reading (no Christian would have substituted 'being angry' for 'being moved with compassion'; the reverse substitution would easily occur). But their appearance in Mark is significant. Commentators suggest that Jesus' anger was caused by the flattery of 'If thou wilt, thou canst,' or the doubt of His will to heal; and that Jesus 'cast him out' because no leper had a right to enter a house. But followed as it is by the strong command to silence about the cure, and preceded by the renunciation of miracle-working at Capernaum (iv. 43 above; Mark i. 38), Jesus' emotion seems to have been caused by the interruption to His work of teaching, and by the popular enthusiasm for Himself as a wonder-worker that He saw would follow. Mark goes on to tell (Mark i. 45; Luke softens it down and Matthew omits it) how the man flatly disobeyed Jesus. 'But he went out and began to announce it widely and spread the story abroad, so that Jesus could no longer enter a town openly but was outside in deserted places.' Retirement, and interruption of teaching, inevitably followed when the popular enthusiasm was stirred.

14. *shew thyself to the priest.* By Lev. xiii and xiv the priests were given the responsibility of examining cases of leprosy and admitting those that were healed to society again. They had full instructions to help them to judge. If the man was passed by the priests as 'clean,' he offered a specified offering and was then ceremonially cleansed. Here Jesus follows His usual course of submission to the Law so far as it did not conflict with the higher Law of Love.

for a testimony unto them. These words should be taken as part of one clause with what precedes—'as Moses ordered for a testimony unto them,' i.e. the people in general.

17 And it came to pass on one of those days, that he was
teaching; and there were Pharisees and doctors of the law
sitting by, which were come out of every village of Galilee
and Judæa and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was
18 with him to heal. And behold, men bring on a bed a man
that was palsied: and they sought to bring him in, and to
19 lay him before him. And not finding by what *way* they might
bring him in because of the multitude, they went up to the
housetop, and let him down through the tiles with his couch
20 into the midst before Jesus. And seeing their faith, he said,

17–26. A PARALYTIC HEALED

Mark ii. 1–12; Matthew ix. 1–8

17. Luke adds this verse as a preface to the incident which follows. He seems to regard the occasion as an important one and brings to hear Jesus 'Pharisees and scribes from all Palestine.' Mark merely has 'many.' For the Pharisees and scribes, mentioned here for the first time in Luke, see Appendix I.

19. *they went up to the housetop.* Mark here has 'they uncovered the roof where he was; and when they had broken it up....' Luke transforms the Palestinian clay-roofed house into a Roman house with a tiled roof and an impluvium. They went up to the roof by the outside staircase, leading, as usual in the East, to the flat roof.

20. Some critics attack the authenticity of this part of the narrative. It is suggested that originally the incident was simply a miracle of healing, and that *vv.* 20*b*–24 (5*b*–10 in Mark ii) were inserted later to assert for the Church the 'right of forgiving sins in the name of Jesus.' It is true that the assertion of the power to forgive sins here by Jesus, *as a Messianic right*, seems to conflict with the attitude of secrecy with regard to His Messiahship that Mark represents Jesus as adopting. But Jesus does not necessarily say more here (see note on *v.* 24 below) than that God uses man to forgive sins. In Jewish thought, moreover, where suffering was regarded as the punishment of sin and prosperity the reward of goodness, bodily healing and forgiveness went together; and forgiveness of sins was one of the promised blessings of the kingdom. 'The visible influence of Jesus over disease confirms His power to forgive, which cannot be tested by sight. It is as herald of the kingdom rather than as Messiah that Jesus claims this authority' (H. G. Wood in *Peake's Commentary*). It is not improbable, however, that the story owes its present form (and in particular, perhaps, *v.* 24) to 'theological' influence. Creed says (p. 80): 'It is impossible to reconstruct with security the words that Jesus used. Nathan pronounced absolution upon David (2 Sam. xii. 13). A similar prophetic absolution on the part of Jesus would be likely to arouse the antagonism of the scribes, and this may lie at the foundation of this narrative of controversy, which, as it stands, is a later literary growth.'

Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. And the scribes and the 21
Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this that speaketh
blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone? But 22
Jesus perceiving their reasonings, answered and said unto
them, What reason ye in your hearts? Whether is easier, to 23
say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk?
But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on 24

23. *Whether is easier.* No one could see the result of a promise of forgiveness of sins: the success or failure of an order to rise and walk would be instantly visible.

24. *the Son of man.* The meaning of this phrase, and its use in the Gospels, is an obscure and complicated subject. The main facts only will be given here. It is only used by Jesus Himself.

The phrase 'son of man' is a literal translation of a Hebrew expression which means 'man'—humanity in general, e.g. Ps. viii: 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him: and the son of man, that thou visitest him?' Cf. Ps. cxliv: 'Lord, what is man, that thou hast such respect unto him: or the son of man, that thou so regardest him?' In Ezekiel, the prophet is repeatedly called 'thou son of man.' But the phrase acquires special significance in certain later Jewish writings. In one of Daniel's visions (Dan. vii) the heathen empires are symbolised as 'beasts,' while Israel is represented by 'one like unto a son of man,' who comes on the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days to receive the kingdom. In the 'Similitudes of Enoch' (*c.* 100 B.C.) it is used as a description of the Messiah who sits on the 'throne of glory' beside 'the Lord of Spirits' to judge the world. This Messiah is first described as 'one whose face was as the appearance of a man,' and is afterwards referred to as 'the' or 'that' Son of man. So also in other apocalyptic literature.

In some of the passages where the phrase appears in the Gospels it may be translated in the usual O.T. sense of 'man.' Such are (probably) the present passage, and more certainly, vi. 5: the same original sense has probably been misunderstood and translated as a proper name in xii. 10.

There are a number of passages in which the 'Son of Man' is referred to as being about to 'come in glory.' xxi. 27 is a clear example. This is the sense from Enoch.

Another series of passages represents Jesus as using the title when referring to His coming suffering and death, e.g. ix. 22. The idea of a suffering 'Son of Man' is entirely new to Jewish thought and is due to Jesus Himself—as He came to see that rejection and death was for Him the necessary path to 'glory.' [Some think that in these two sets of passages Jesus' use of the phrase was intentionally ambiguous: the people generally, that is to say, would not suppose that He meant Himself.]

In some other passages, e.g. ix. 58, it appears likely that the use of the phrase (which seems to be merely a synonym for 'I') is due to the

earth to forgive sins (he said unto him that was palsied),
I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto
25 thy house. And immediately he rose up before them, and
took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his house,
26 glorifying God. And amazement took hold on all, and they
glorified God; and they were filled with fear, saying, We have
seen strange things to-day.
27 And after these things he went forth, and beheld a publican,
named Levi, sitting at the place of toll, and said unto him,
28 Follow me. And he forsook all, and rose up and followed
29 him. And Levi made him a great feast in his house: and there

thought of later Christians who introduced the phrase simply as a title of Jesus, without any special significance.

Full discussions of what the phrase implied to Jesus Himself, as well as to those who heard it, will be found in Montefiore, I, pp. 64–80; and *B. of C.* I, pp. 368–84. In spite of all that has been written on the subject the mists of uncertainty still hang over it: it seems doubtful whether they will ever completely lift.

sins—he said. The peculiarly broken construction is preserved in Mark, Matthew, and Luke: a fact which in the days of the 'Higher Criticism' controversy was a powerful weapon in the hands of those who maintained the literary connection of the Gospels.

27–32. JESUS CALLS LEVI AND DINES IN HIS HOUSE

Mark ii. 13–17; Matthew ix. 9–13

27. *Levi.* Matthew reads 'Matthew': Mark 'Levi the son of Alphaeus.' From the general similarity of Matthew's account here to that of Mark and Luke, the Matthew mentioned there has traditionally been identified with Levi: though Clement of Alexandria distinguished the two (*Stromata*, IV, 9). It appears to have been not uncommon in Galilee for a man to have two names.

'Capernaum was on the Great West road which led from Damascus to the Mediterranean, and like Jericho had its establishment of "publicans" and its toll-house, but the tolls were here collected for the tetrarch and not for the Emperor' (Swete, *St Mark, ad loc.*). Matthew's occupation would be to examine the goods that passed along the road, and levy the toll on them. The custom-house officers as well as the tax-gatherers proper were members of the hated 'publican' class: their office seems to have given them opportunities for extortion.

28. *he forsook all.* Peculiar to Luke (cp. *v.* 11 above). This is not strictly consistent with what follows: but Luke is thinking of Levi's abandonment of his way of life rather than of his actual possessions.

29. *Levi made him a great feast in his house.* Mark 'it came to pass that he was sitting at meat in his house.' From Mark's version it has

was a great multitude of publicans and of others that were sitting at meat with them. And the Pharisees and their 30
scribes murmured against his disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with the publicans and sinners? And Jesus 31
answering said unto them, They that are whole have no need of a physician; but they that are sick. I am not come to call 32
the righteous but sinners to repentance. And they said unto 33
him, The disciples of John fast often, and make supplications; likewise also the *disciples* of the Pharisees; but thine eat and drink. And Jesus said unto them, Can ye make the sons of 34
the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?

been suggested that the feast was held at Jesus' house. But Luke's version at any rate leaves no room for doubt. The incident is natural as Luke tells it. Jesus wants to get into touch with the publicans and begins with Levi; his acceptance of the call brings others of his class into contact with Jesus. Montefiore (1, p. 86) makes a striking comment on the occasion: 'Jesus did not avoid sinners, but sought them out: this was a new and sublime contribution to the development of religion and morality.'

of publicans and of others. Mark 'publicans and sinners.' Luke refrains from calling them sinners here. He leaves the Pharisees to use the word in the next verse. As used by the scribes and Pharisees it would not necessarily be applied to men who were literally or notoriously sinners, but to all who failed to reach the official standard of Pharisaic piety. Cp. xix. 7 (of Zacchaeus).

30. *the Pharisees and their scribes.* Mark 'the scribes of the Pharisees.' From Mark's phrase, which Luke here follows, it appears that there were scribes who belonged to other parties than the Pharisees, i.e. Sadducean scribes. No doubt most of the scribes were Pharisees, for the scribes' profession was to interpret the Law, and the Pharisees were those whose professed object it was to regulate their lives in strict accordance with the Law.

33–35. FASTING

Mark ii. 18–20; Matthew ix. 14, 15

33. *And they said.* In Mark the questioners are 'the disciples of John and the Pharisees,' who were fasting. In Matthew the disciples of John only. Luke appears to represent the incident as a continuation of the conversation in Levi's house. The questioners then must be presumed to be the Pharisees and scribes of *v.* 30—yet in this verse they speak of the disciples of the Pharisees in the third person.

make supplications. Luke has obscured Mark's reference to a definite fast day, and therefore supplies the word *often* here, and makes the question more general still by adding the reference to prayer, though this has no real part in the discussion.

34. *the sons of the bride-chamber.* A Hebrew phrase meaning 'the

35 But the days will come; and when the bridegroom shall be
taken away from them, then will they fast in those days.
36 And he spake also a parable unto them; No man rendeth a
piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old garment;

friends of the bridegroom.' Fasting, says Jesus, is only useful as an expression of real feeling. Jesus calls His disciples to joy, of which fasting cannot be the true expression.

35. This verse, as forecasting Jesus' death, has been regarded either as spoken later in Jesus' life when He had begun to tell His disciples of the future, or as the product of the Church at a later date, perhaps to justify the Christian custom of fasting. But it is not impossible that the arrest of John Baptist and the increasing friction between Himself and the Jewish leaders may have suggested to Jesus, even at this early date, that He would Himself before long be in danger. And in any case the verse has no definite reference to a *violent* death, and might well be understood of a natural death at a distant date. Yet no doubt Luke found an allegorical meaning in the passage. 'Christ, the Bridegroom of the future, by His presence on earth, had given to His own a foretaste of the joys of the Kingdom' (Easton).

36–39. THE OLD AND THE NEW

Mark ii. 21, 22; Matthew ix. 16, 17

36. *And he spake also a parable unto them.* By adding this introduction to the following sayings Luke appears to wish to indicate that the subject of the sayings is wider than that of the conversation which precedes them: i.e. that instead of their subject being the incompatibility of fasting and Christianity, Jesus is here referring to the general relation between the old religion and the new. Mark, in arranging the sayings at this point, appears to have connected them with fasting: but no doubt Luke is right and Jesus spoke them with a wider application. See note on *v.* 38 below.

rendeth a piece from a new garment. Mark 'seweth a piece of undressed cloth.' The patch of undressed cloth, of which Mark speaks, is in Luke replaced by a piece taken from a new garment: and the point of the saying thereby becomes different. In Mark the action is foolish because the undressed, stiff, cloth will tear away from the edge of the hole: in Luke it is entirely absurd because the action involves spoiling a new garment as well as not effectively mending the old. Holtzmann suggests that Luke made the change because in his time Christianity had become as it were a garment of itself, distinct from Judaism, not merely a 'piece of cloth.' But Lagrange is nearer the mark when he says: 'It is probable that Luke simply wished to model the first comparison on the second. In the latter, even in Mark, the mixture (combination) is fatal to both; Luke wished to draw the same sense from the first comparison, at the risk of supposing something very unlikely.' Others think that tradition had varied the form of Jesus' saying before it came into Luke's hands.

else he will rend the new, and also the piece from the new will not agree with the old. And no man putteth new wine 37
into old wine-skins; else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spilled, and the skins will perish. But new 38
wine must be put into fresh wine-skins. And no man having 39
drunk old *wine* desireth new: for he saith, The old is good.

Now it came to pass on a sabbath, that he was going 6
through the cornfields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands. But certain 2
of the Pharisees said, Why do ye that which it is not lawful

37. It is scarcely necessary to point out how completely the A.V. rendering 'bottles' missed the point. An old wine-skin, cracked and dry, would not be able to withstand the pressure of the fermenting new wine.

38. As has been said above, these two illustrations are probably to be understood as referring to the *general* incompatibility of old and new, and not to any particular point of difference. The new teaching can only be received by new men, not bound by old prejudices. Old tradition cannot contain new life. Jesus never condemned Judaism in its best forms: but He insisted that His teaching could not possibly be combined with the narrower legalistic view of religion which was so common in His day.

39. This verse is peculiar to Luke. It is possible that it was contained in Luke's source without any indication of context, and was placed here by Luke because it also was concerned with wine. It represents the attitude of conservatism towards innovation: but its exact application is doubtful. Thus: 'A sympathetic concession to Jewish feeling' (Burnside). 'John's disciples may rightly continue their own practices' (Grieve in *Peake's Commentary*). 'Jesus represents a new spirit, He has come to call sinners and they have responded to His appeal. Levi even has become His disciple. For these new men (cp. *v.* 38 above) new suggestions (Fr. *inspirations*) are needed. It is this that the others cannot understand' (Lagrange). Perhaps Jesus spoke it with sarcasm—or a smile. Easton points out that the obvious superiority of old wine to new would not be felt by Eastern, as by Western, hearers.

VI. 1–5. THE INCIDENT IN THE CORNFIELDS

Mark ii. 23–28; Matthew xii. 1–8

2. The Pharisees were not finding fault with the disciples for taking someone else's property (Deut. xxiii. 25: 'When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand'). But the plucking of the corn would be regarded as a kind of reaping (and the 'rubbing,' which Luke mentions, as threshing or winnowing): thus these, and many other similarly trivial actions,

3 to do on the sabbath day? And Jesus answering them said,
Have ye not read even this, what David did, when he was
4 an hungred, he, and they that were with him; how he entered
into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread,
and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not
5 lawful to eat save for the priests alone? And he said unto
them, The Son of man is lord of the sabbath.

would be regarded as breaches of the sabbath by the strictest interpreters of the Law.

3. Jesus meets His critics on their own ground by quoting (from 1 Sam. xxi) an historic example of a breach of the Law from a similar motive of hunger. 'David, "a man after God's own heart," disregarded the strict letter of the sabbath Law when it became burdensome instead of beneficial. Why should not we?' The argument seems to assume that the disciples were in real need of food—as David had been.

4. Mark has the words 'when Abiathar was high priest,' which are in conflict with the mention of Ahimelech as high-priest in 1 Sam. xxi. This may have been a mere mistake on Mark's part: Mark i. 1, where a quotation from Malachi is ascribed to Isaiah, seems to indicate second-hand knowledge only of the O.T. Or it may be due to confusion in Jewish tradition. Matthew and Luke both omit the words here: either because they recognised the mistake or because the words had been omitted (as an error) from their text of Mark.

the shewbread. Lev. xxiv. 5–9 orders that 12 loaves of fine flour shall be set on the 'pure table before the Lord' every sabbath. The offering of food to the god is characteristic of many primitive religions, and the intention was originally that the god should eat it. With the Jews the shewbread was felt to be a sign of Jehovah's presence and of his acceptance of their worship. Verse 9 in Lev. xxiv commands that the shewbread shall be eaten by Aaron and his son.

5. Matthew and Luke both omit Mark ii. 27: 'The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: so that....' This is probably owing to their interpretation of the next verse. To them 'son of man' here no doubt meant Jesus, and on this view the connection with the verse of Mark which they have omitted is by no means easy to see. Mark's version strongly favours the interpretation here of 'son of man' in the sense of 'man' simply (cp. note on v. 24 above): and Mark himself may possibly have understood it so.

In Matthew and Luke the argument is (strengthened by Matthew's additions (Matt. xii. 5–7)): 'David broke the sabbath law and was blameless: I, the Son of Man, can do the same. I control the sabbath: I can alter its law.' This is a claim to arbitrary authority that is clearly unlike Jesus. But if, in Mark, 'son of man' is taken as meaning 'man,' the argument is natural enough. 'In the case of David human need was allowed to overrule the letter of the law: thereby the purpose of the Law, which is man's good, was furthered. The purpose of the sabbath is man's good: therefore man should use it in such a way as

may best tend towards that end, if necessary allowing the furtherance of that end to overrule the letter of the law' ('Therefore man is master of the sabbath'). What Montefiore says here is interesting: 'So far as we can gather, Jesus' attitude towards the sabbath was something like the attitude of Liberal Judaism to-day. It must be observed rather in the spirit than in the letter. The regulations for its observance must not be allowed to destroy its intention. Directly the sabbath becomes a burden the object of the sabbath is frustrated. The aim is the important point: how precisely we carry out the aim is less important. Nevertheless, one must not push the antithesis between Jesus and the Rabbinic teaching too far.... In spite of the many restrictions and regulations the sabbath was upon the whole a joy and a blessing to the immense majority of Jews throughout the Rabbinic period. Yet this fact does not detract from the greatness and originality of Jesus. His teaching is an excellent counterbalance to that casuistic minuteness which is the danger of legalism. It is emancipating: it enables one to breathe freely' (I, pp. 63–4).

One of the best MSS puts this verse after *v.* 10 below and instead of it inserts these remarkable words: 'The same day, seeing someone working on the sabbath day, He said to him: "Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou: but if thou knowest not, cursed art thou and a transgressor of the Law."'

A full discussion of this passage will be found in McLachlan, *St Luke, The Man and his Work*, p. 230 f. McLachlan argues that the saying is an original part of Luke's work: and explains its absence from other MSS as due to its having been at some time dropped as likely to give offence to Jewish Christians in the East, but preserved in Rome where there was no reason to omit it. Other critics suggest that the saying is 'too subtle and Pauline' for Jesus. (The phrase 'transgressor of the law' occurs in Rom. ii. 25 and 27, and also in James ii. 11. The thought of the saying is similar to that of Paul's phrase in Rom. xiv. 23: 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.') Others that Jesus would not have gone so far 'in open approval of a direct violation of one of the most fundamental injunctions of the Law and of one of the Ten Commandments.'

It is a bold saying, but not too bold for Jesus. And it fits the present context admirably. 'The sabbath worker is blessed if he acts of purpose and from necessity with a good conscience, as David did when he took the shewbread, or as the disciples when they plucked the ears of corn, or as their Master when He healed on the sabbath day' (McLachlan). It is the logical development of the words 'The sabbath was made for man: therefore man is master of the sabbath.' Montefiore says: 'It embodies the very principle of Liberal Judaism in its changes and reforms. Mere ignorant deviation from, or abandonment of, tradition and orthodoxy is valueless or even bad.... Still worse is violation of orthodox practice from mere indifference, apathy or convenience. The only right deviation or violation is deliberate, intentional, with full *connaissance de cause*' (II, p. 409).

6 And it came to pass on another sabbath, that he entered
into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man there,
7 and his right hand was withered. And the scribes and the
Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sab-
8 bath; that they might find how to accuse him. But he knew
their thoughts; and he said to the man that had his hand
withered, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he
9 arose and stood forth. And Jesus said unto them, I ask you,
Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good, or to do harm? to save
10 a life, or to destroy it? And he looked round about on them
all, and said unto him, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did
11 *so*: and his hand was restored. But they were filled with
madness; and communed one with another what they might
do to Jesus.

6–11. THE MAN WITH THE WITHERED HAND

Mark iii. 1–6; Matthew xii. 9–14

6. *another.* Luke distinguishes this sabbath from the one on which the last incident occurred. Mark and Matthew give the impression that they were the same.

Luke alone says that it was his *right* hand. Cp. Luke xxii. 50, where he agrees with the Fourth Gospel in saying that it was the right ear of the high-priest's servant which Peter cut off. Hobart sees in this an indication of the medical precision which notes the exact position of the disease or defect.

8. As in ix. 47 Luke adds the statement that Jesus read the thoughts of those around Him while the other evangelists leave it to be implied. Luke also adds to Mark's account the fact that the man at once obeyed the command of Jesus.

9. Jesus regarded the failure to do good when possible as a definite act of evil. Thus to fail to save life was tantamount to killing. The orthodox Jewish answer to this argument would be that healing was permissible on the sabbath only when life was in danger.

10. Mark says that Jesus 'looked round on them *with anger*, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts.' Matthew and Luke as usual omit His anger. Jesus' anger arose because He knew that they would condemn Him if He did not *omit* to do good. How well the story illustrates the falseness of the 'gentle Jesus, meek and mild' conception! Jesus' anger blazes up at the pitiful perversion of true religion,—could men conceivably think that God would rather a sabbath law kept than a dead arm brought to life?—He disregards the smouldering hostility, and with undaunted courage faces the consequences which He knew must follow.

11. *madness.* This word, which Luke alone uses here, expresses the frenzy which the Pharisees felt against Jesus, which was futile and foolish because it was based on so fundamentally warped ideas of right

And it came to pass in these days, that he went out into 12
the mountain to pray; and he continued all night in prayer
to God. And when it was day, he called his disciples: and 13
he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles;
Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, 14

and wrong. Jesus' boldness and disregard of their opposition disconcerts them and hurts their pride.

12–16. THE APPOINTMENT OF THE TWELVE

Mark iii. 13–19; Matthew x. 1–4

The three Synoptists differ in their use of this section. Matthew places it before Jesus' breach with the Pharisees, and makes the motive of His action His seeing the crowds 'as sheep having no shepherd.' Mark and Luke both place it just after the Pharisees' 'declaration of war' (*v.* 11 above), thus giving the idea (as Lagrange points out) that Jesus' action was the first consequence of His parting with official Judaism. Now that the old religion had rejected Him, He must take steps to establish His system independently of the old. The first step is the appointment of the Twelve. This is a very natural sequence of events.

Mark and Luke, however, themselves differ in their exact arrangement of the verses. Mark describes first the coming of the crowds, and Jesus' retirement, first to a boat and then to the mountain, to avoid them: then the call of the Twelve. Luke reverses this order and describes how Jesus went to the mountain to pray, prayed all night, and in the morning called the Twelve: then the crowd assembled. The explanation of this is no doubt that Luke wishes to preface so important an event as the call of the Twelve by a reference to prayer on the part of Jesus. 'Jésus avec Dieu, avec les Douze, avec la foule qu'il guérit et évangélise, voilà sans doute l'ordre que Luc a cru plus approprié à l'histoire telle qu'il la comprenait' (Lagrange, *ad loc.*). In several cases Luke is alone in referring to prayers of Jesus: cp. iii. 21, v. 16, ix. 18, 29, xi. 1. [No doubt Luke is influenced, here and in the next verse, by the practice of the early Church on such occasions.]

12. *continued all night.* The momentous nature of the choosing of the Twelve is shewn by the all-night vigil. The constant dependence of Jesus upon contact with God is one of the most strongly marked features of His life.

13. Luke appears to assume that Jesus Himself gave them the name of apostles at this time. Mark does not suggest this: and if Jesus gave them the name Himself, it is obviously more probable that He did not do so until He had 'sent them out' on their Mission of Preaching and Healing. But probably the origin of the term is later than Jesus.

14. *whom he also named Peter.* Not necessarily on this occasion. Up to this point Luke has called him Simon (Simon Peter in v. 8): after this he calls him Peter, except in xxii. 31 and xxiv. 34, where he is quoting other people's words.

15 and James and John, and Philip and Bartholomew, and
Matthew and Thomas, and James *the son* of Alphæus, and
16 Simon which was called the Zealot, and Judas *the son* of
17 James, and Judas Iscariot, which was the traitor; and he

Bartholomew: usually identified with the Nathanael of John i. 45–51 and xxi. 2. The identification rests on these probabilities (Plummer in *HDCG*): (1) Bartholomew is a patronymic and the bearer of it may well have had another name. (2) The Synoptists never mention Nathanael, John never Bartholomew. (3) The Synoptists put Bartholomew next to Philip, who brought Nathanael to Jesus. (4) All the other disciples mentioned in John i become apostles. (5) All the companions of Nathanael in John xxi are apostles.

15. *James the son of Alphæus.* Sometimes identified with the 'James the Little' of Mark xv. 40. But this depends on the suggestion that Alphaeus and Clopas are different forms of the same Aramaic name, and is uncertain. He is certainly not 'the Lord's brother' (who wrote the Epistle), for Jesus' brethren only came to believe in Him later.

Simon which was called the Zealot. Mark and Matthew call him 'the Cananaean.' This word, of which 'of Cana' or 'of Canaan' are equally erroneous translations, is an Aramaic word which means 'a Zealot.' Luke has translated it into Greek. It has usually been assumed that since the time of the Maccabees the extreme anti-Roman patriotic party had been known by this name. It is more probable, however, that the sect of the Zealots did not exist as a definite party before A.D. 66. If so, the name may merely be an expression of Simon's character: 'Simon the zealous.'

16. *Judas the son of James.* In Luke's list this name takes the place of Mark's 'Thaddaeus.' In Mark some MSS call him 'Lebbaeus' and in Matthew there is a Latin reading 'Judas Zelotes.' The Fourth Gospel (John xiv. 22) speaks of a 'Judas, not Iscariot': and this may well be he. His identity with Thaddaeus (by having two names, cp. Matthew-Levi, Bartholomew-Nathanael) is possible but not demonstrable. In the names of the less known Apostles the lists of the authorities used by Luke and Mark may well have differed. In any case there is no reason for translating Luke's phrase as 'Judas *the brother of* James' (A.V.). The phrase naturally means *son of* James, and Luke may have wished to distinguish him from Judas Iscariot. The translation of A.V. no doubt arose from the identification of this Jude with the writer of the Epistle of Jude, who describes himself as 'the brother of James.'

Iscariot. The word is thought to mean 'of Kerioth,' a place in Judaea mentioned in Josh. xv. 25. Its locality is not known. In John vi. 71 and xiii. 26 he is called Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, which supports the suggestion that Iscariot is a place-name.

came down with them, and stood on a level place, and a great multitude of his disciples, and a great number of the people from all Judæa and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were troubled with unclean 18
spirits were healed. And all the multitude sought to touch 19
him: for power came forth from him, and healed *them* all.

17–19. THE COLLECTING OF THE CROWDS

Mark iii. 7–12; cp. Matthew xii. 15 f.

For Luke's general use of this section see note at the beginning of *v.* 12 above.

17. *on a level place.* This phrase has led to the discourse which Luke gives below, being called 'The Sermon on the Plain': but since Jesus has just been 'into the mountain,' the words do not mean more than that He came down to level ground again.

to hear him. Luke adds this, to prepare for the discourse which follows. In Mark the crowd's purpose is merely to be healed.

20–49. THE SERMON 'ON THE PLAIN'

The relation of this discourse to the 'Sermon on the Mount' in Matthew v–vii has been much discussed. The following facts should be noticed:

(1) Matthew's discourse is four times as long as Luke's.

(2) Both have the same beginning (the Beatitudes), and the same ending (the parable of the Houses on the Sand and the Rock). Both are followed immediately by the story of the Centurion's Servant, which is not in Mark.

(3) None of the passages in Matthew's discourse which deal with the Law appear in Luke, either here or in other contexts (except Matt. v. 18 which appears in Luke xvi. 17), whereas many sayings on other subjects which in Matthew form part of the discourse appear in Luke in different contexts. Very little of the Lucan sermon is absent from Matthew.

(4) In some of the parallel passages in the two discourses (for instance, the Beatitudes) the divergences are very great: too great, it would seem, to allow of the theory that Matthew and Luke used *the same* written source.

The second fact noted above suggests that portions of the discourse (all the passages where Luke is parallel to Matthew, and possibly other passages, such as those dealing with the Law, which may have been omitted by Luke as not suitable for Gentile readers) together with (perhaps) an introduction about the gathering of the crowds, and followed by the story of the Centurion's Servant, stood in Q. The fact that passages which are contained in Matthew's discourse appear in Luke in different contexts may be explained by Matthew's habit of

20 And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed

collecting together into long discourses scattered sayings on similar subjects. The divergences between Luke and Matthew (when parallel) have been explained in various ways. Stanton thinks that Matthew and Luke used two different translations of Q. Others have felt it sufficient to suppose that Matthew and Luke used different editions of Q, or that their divergences are due to the effect of oral tradition—of catechetical use of the sayings. Streeter holds that Matthew had two discourses before him (which occasionally overlapped), 'one from Q practically identical with Luke's Sermon on the Plain, the other from M' (by this name Streeter designates the Palestinian source peculiar to Matthew) 'containing a much longer Sermon.' 'Having conflated the two Sermons from Q and M, Matthew proceeded to add to them certain other passages of Q, which Luke gives later in his Gospel in what is more likely to be their original context' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 251 f.). Where Luke's version differs from Matthew's, the question which is the more original will be considered in the notes to the sayings concerned. As it stands in Luke, the sermon is a simple summary of all that is most characteristic in Jesus' teaching, and may well represent the substance of what Jesus addressed to the Galilean peasants in the early days of His Ministry.

20–23. THE BEATITUDES

Cp. Matthew v. 1 f.

Here at once the difference between Matthew and Luke becomes apparent and striking. Matthew has eight beatitudes, Luke four. Matthew calls 'blessed' those who possess certain *moral* and *spiritual* qualities: Luke refers to those who are enduring *physical* hardship and suffering. But if the circumstances be kept in mind under which the words were originally spoken, the difference will be seen to be not fundamental. Jesus was speaking to His disciples, not to the crowds; that is to say, to those who had already shewn some readiness to receive His teaching. And those to whom He spoke were in point of fact almost all 'poor' themselves (see next note but one). For a long time the type of character most ready to receive Jesus' teaching was found among the poor—the faithful, unprejudiced mind. The rich, in Jesus' time, were almost all opposed to Him or indifferent. Luke's version is no doubt the more original, and Matthew's applies Jesus' words to a wider circle. In Luke Jesus says *not* 'Blessed are the poor and the hungry, *because of* their poverty and hunger': but 'Blessed are you *although* you are poor, because of your humility, which makes you fit for the blessings to come.' Matthew's version shews how the words may still be applicable to those who are not physically poor or suffering, if they have the same humility of spirit which actual poverty and suffering tend to produce.

20. *Blessed.* 'Happy' is a better word here in modern speech. The contrast is between the happiness, whatever their circumstances, of those who seek for and find the things in life that really matter—

are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed *are* ye 21
that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed *are* ye that
weep now: for ye shall laugh. Blessed are ye, when men shall 22
hate you, and when they shall separate you *from their company*, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for
the Son of man's sake. Rejoice in that day, and leap *for joy*: 23
for behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the same

humility, goodness, purity—and the happiness which is popularly supposed to come from pleasure and prosperity. Jesus looks round at those who are listening to Him and says to them: 'What real happiness you may hope for! You have little of what the world counts worth having, but you have really won what matters most—the qualities of the character of God.'

poor. The Greek word here is the equivalent of an Aramaic term which had come to hold a special significance in Jewish religious literature. In the O.T. the 'poor' are the faithful worshippers of God —without wealth, often maltreated and humiliated, and yet looking steadily to God for help (Ps. lxxii. 2, 4, xxxvii. 11; Is. lxvi. 2). 'This estimate of poverty is probably to be explained by historical circumstances. The foreign influences which began to operate in the period succeeding the Exile had chiefly affected the richer classes, while the poor still clung to the ancient traditions' (*HDCG*, art. 'Poverty of Spirit'). The word 'describes the pious in Israel, for the most part literally poor, whom the worldly rich despised and persecuted' (McNeile). In Jesus' day the word could still bear this meaning. The wealthy among the Jews were in a far more favourable position than the poor with regard to the fulfilment of the Law and its external requirements: and thus they acquired the self-satisfaction and pride which killed their true religious spirit, and made them contemptuous of 'the people that knoweth not the Law' (John vii. 49). Matthew expresses this clearly enough in his 'poor in spirit.'

21. *ye that hunger.* Matt. 'they that hunger and thirst after righteousness.'

ye shall be filled. The reward here is in the future, for there is no hope for them of being 'filled' in this world. Yet the word must not be limited to anything material only. Its use in the LXX (Ps. cvii. 9, 'he satisfieth the hungry soul'; xvii. 15, 'when I awake up after thy likeness, I shall be satisfied with it') implies the spiritual 'filling' which Matthew's version suggests. The disciple who has grasped the values that Jesus taught will not regard anything material as his highest aim.

weep...laugh. Stronger words than Matthew's 'mourn...be comforted.'

22. The words in this verse need not be pressed to any particular reference. They describe the general unpopularity and hatred that Jesus' disciples will have to face.

23. For Jesus' teaching about future rewards—the morality of which is sometimes challenged—see the note after xvi. 9.

24 manner did their fathers unto the prophets. But woe unto
you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.
25 Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger.
Woe *unto you*, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and
26 weep. Woe *unto you*, when all men shall speak well of you!
for in the same manner did their fathers to the false prophets.
27 But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do

24–26. THE WOES

Peculiar to Luke

These four sentences are the direct converse of the four blessings Luke has given. They describe the qualities which exclude from the Kingdom—the self-satisfaction and pride of the majority of wealthy Jews of the day. The words may have been uttered by Jesus as a warning, though the directness of their address seems out of place in this discourse to the disciples. More probably they have been added to the four beatitudes to emphasise them by contrast. Their form would be suggested by such passages as Deut. xxvii. 15 f. or Is. v. 8 f. Cp. Matt. xxiii.

24. *woe unto you.* The phrase is not so much a curse as an expression of pity, 'Alas for.'

ye have received. 'Ye are paid in full.' The Greek word was used for signing a receipt. 'Alas for you who made wealth all your desire: you have got it—and that is all you will get—God has nothing further to give you.'

26. To be universally popular is in few cases a sign of strong character. Cf. John xv. 19: 'If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world...therefore the world hateth you.'

27–36. THE LAW OF LOVE

Cp. Matthew v. 39 f.

27. *Love your enemies.* The Greek verb used here is *agapān*, which is common in classical writers: the noun *agapē* (love), however, appears only in the Bible and Christian writings. *agapān*, in contrast to the more common word *philein*, implies regard rather than passion: and this distinction is usually observed in the N.T. (cp. especially John xxi. 15 f.). *philein* means 'to like,' 'to be fond of': *agapān*, 'to regard with brotherly love,' 'to be eager and ready to help.' The word *agapē* expresses the new spirit which Christians found among them in the early Church—the 'love-fellowship.' And the use of the noun with such a meaning justifies the assignment of a similar meaning to the verb when used in the N.T.: to love a man, not necessarily because you like him, but because you and he are both members of the same 'Love-Society.' To 'like' has been described as the perfect tense of to 'love' in this sense. This significance of the word *agapān* will soften the difficulty often felt over this paradoxical passage. Jesus is not

good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray 28
for them that despitefully use you. To him that smiteth thee 29
on the *one* cheek offer also the other; and from him that
taketh away thy cloke withhold not thy coat also. Give to 30
every one that asketh thee; and of him that taketh away thy

here telling men *to be fond of* their enemies, which, however watered down as an ideally exaggerated precept, would still have an artificial ring. Service, not emotional affection, is what is demanded. He tells them not to regard an enemy as outside the love-fellowship, and therefore unworthy of help and kindness, just because he is an enemy: but to be willing and anxious to help him when it is possible. To the practicability, no less than to the grandeur, of the conception of *agapē* heroism and unselfishness have borne witness in every age of the Christian Church.

29. The first half of the verse is much the same in Matthew (v. 39), but the second half differs in two ways from Matthew's version. Matthew has (v. 40) 'and if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.' Matthew supposes a lawsuit, Luke a theft: in Matthew the 'tunic' is taken first, the 'over-coat' second, in Luke the order is reversed. Probably Luke is nearer to the original. Matthew's alterations are due first to the desire to differentiate this precept from the one immediately preceding it, by making it a matter of legal suit, not violence; and secondly to the wish to heighten the emphasis by representing the more important and valuable 'over-coat' as the garment to be voluntarily given up.

29–30. These two verses, which enforce the principle of non-retaliation, are in reality the converse of *vv.* 27 and 28, but are perhaps more startling at first sight. Opponents of Christianity have long objected that the literal fulfilment of Jesus' teaching here would put an end to society and bring about anarchy. Some Christian commentators have used the verses as one of their arguments for an ultra-apocalyptic view of Jesus—'these injunctions seem primarily in keeping with the anticipation of a speedy end of the age.' But the verses do no more than express at its highest the attitude towards personal rights that the Christian view of life must bring. The knowledge that material things are not in the long run the things that matter must make the true Christian 'sit loose' to wealth and power and personal comfort. None of these things will have any weight in the balance against the good of others—against what Love dictates. Yet again the application of the principle of non-resistance will be itself dictated by Love. 'Love has no limits but those that Love itself imposes.' To shew the burglar where the plate is kept rather than to send for the police would be a course of action involving little real Love either for the burglar himself or for his future victims. Yet the performance of such resistance—war, for instance—as the good of society may require from its members, does not exclude the recognition that such a state of affairs is lower than the ideal. The greater the activity of positive Love, in education, in the amelioration of condi-

goods ask them not again. And as ye would that men should
do to you, do ye also to them likewise. And if ye love them
that love you, what thank have ye? for even sinners love
those that love them. And if ye do good to them that do
good to you, what thank have ye? for even sinners do the
same. And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive,
what thank have ye? even sinners lend to sinners, to receive
again as much. But love your enemies, and do *them* good,
and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great,
and ye shall be sons of the Most High: for he is kind toward
the unthankful and evil. Be ye merciful, even as your Father
is merciful. And judge not, and ye shall not be judged: and
condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: release, and

tions of living, in the spread of the spirit of fellowship between nations and within communities, the less unattainable will become the ideal of non-resistance.

31. This verse, 'Do as you would be done by,' appears later in Matt. (vii. 12). It may be taken with what precedes, 'Treat your aggressors as you would wish to be treated yourselves if you were aggressors': or, better, as a general principle of disinterested love, of which illustrations follow.

32. *thank*: 'gratitude,' i.e. from God. 'When you love those who love you, you do nothing for God' (Lagrange).

This and the following verses find their point in *vv.* 35*b* and 36. 'God's Love is universal; it knows no limitation of self-interest; it embraces even what is repellent: so should your love be also.'

34. This and the next verse are peculiar to Luke.

35. *never despairing.* This may be variously interpreted: 'never doubting that your creditor will pay' or 'never doubting that God will requite you' (Plummer): 'the verse suggests a patient and persevering help of *apparently* hopeless cases' (Lonsdale Ragg). The objection to this is that the context seems to require a stronger meaning for the phrase, parallel to the paradoxical-sounding 'love your enemies.' The Christian's action must follow a far higher ideal than that of the 'sinners.' It is probably therefore better to accept the rendering of A.V., 'hoping for nothing again,' i.e. 'expecting no return,' though this is not the usual sense of the Greek word. The context strongly suggests this meaning. No question of repayment is to enter the Christian's mind in his lending: his one concern is to be the good of him to whom he lends.

himself as tender.

37–45. SELF-CRITICISM

Cp. Matthew vii. 1 f.

37. 'Don't be hasty in judging other people: if you wish God to be tender towards your faults, be tender yourselves to other people's.'

ye shall be released: give, and it shall be given unto you; 38
good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over,
shall they give into your bosom. For with what measure ye
mete it shall be measured to you again.

And he spake also a parable unto them, Can the blind 39
guide the blind? shall they not both fall into a pit? The 40
disciple is not above his master: but every one when he is
perfected shall be as his master. And why beholdest thou
the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the 41
beam that is in thine own eye? Or how canst thou say to thy
brother, Brother, let me cast out the mote that is in thine 42
eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in
thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out
of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out

39, 40. These two verses appear in Matthew in somewhat different forms in xv. 14 and x. 24, where the contexts are quite different. In Matthew the first refers to the Pharisees, the second to persecution which the disciples must face as well as their Master. Luke interprets them as enjoining caution in judgment. Verse 39 anticipates *vv.* 41 and 42: one must be quite certain one's own sight is clear, before one sets out to guide another. Verse 40 points out that the pupil's progress will depend on his teacher's knowledge and skill: a perfectly equipped pupil presupposes a similar perfection in his teacher. Let the disciples therefore make certain of their own qualifications before they set out to teach others.

41, 42. It is surely not fanciful to see evidence of Jesus' sense of humour in this playful sketch. A man sees a speck of dust in another man's eye. He runs up to him and says, 'My dear fellow, do let me take that out for you: I'm sure you can't see properly with *that* in your eye.' All the time there is an enormous piece of wood sticking out of his own eye, and he doesn't know it is there. One can hardly imagine a more vivid illustration of the ridiculous folly of criticising other people before one criticises oneself. (Cp. T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History*, chap. III.)

41. *mote.* The Greek word means 'any small dry body,' especially a chip of wood.

beam. The Greek word means the main beam of a roof that bears the weight of the rest.

43–45. The general sense of these verses, as Luke has interpreted them in connection with *vv.* 37–42, is the importance of good character as a preliminary to helping any one else. Matthew's use of them is different. In Matt. vii. 16–19 a fuller version of *vv.* 43 and 44 refers to false prophets ('By their fruits ye shall know them'): and in Matt. xii. 35 Luke's *v.* 45 expresses the truth that character is shewn in word and action.

43 the mote that is in thy brother's eye. For there is no good
tree that bringeth forth corrupt fruit; nor again a corrupt
44 tree that bringeth forth good fruit. For each tree is known
by its own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor
45 of a bramble bush gather they grapes. The good man out of
the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is
good; and the evil *man* out of the evil *treasure* bringeth forth
that which is evil: for out of the abundance of the heart his
mouth speaketh.

46 And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things
47 which I say? Every one that cometh unto me, and heareth
my words, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is
48 like: he is like a man building a house, who digged and went
deep, and laid a foundation upon the rock: and when a flood
arose, the stream brake against that house, and could not
49 shake it: because it had been well builded. But he that
heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that built a house upon
the earth without a foundation; against which the stream
brake, and straightway it fell in; and the ruin of that house
was great.

43. 'Look to your own character first: for only a good man can hope to produce good results.'

44. The first half of this verse comes from the passage (Matt. xii. 33 f.) from which Luke takes the next verse; it is not really relevant here. The point here, as Lagrange says, is not how to recognise people's true nature (as it is in the Matthew context), but merely that only good trees can produce good fruit.

45. 'Only a man whose heart is good will be able to do good to others.' A less natural application of the verse than that in Matthew.

46–49. DEEDS NOT WORDS

46. Luke's version of this saying is much shorter than that in Matt. vii. 21–23, and probably nearer to the original.

47–49. Matt. vii. 24–27. An apt conclusion to this collection of the most important elements in Jesus' teaching: only he who builds the house of his life on this foundation can be safe. The two versions of this parable are somewhat different. In Matthew the contrast is between the man who built his house on the rock and the man who built it on the sand. In Luke the contrast is between a man who digs foundations for his house down to the rock and a man who builds the house on the ground without any foundation at all. Luke's version is more vivid and finished in style: and it seems likely that its present form is partly at least due to himself.

Commentators point out that Matthew's version suits conditions in

After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the people, 7
he entered into Capernaum.

And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, 2
was sick and at the point of death. And when he heard 3
concerning Jesus, he sent unto him elders of the Jews, asking
him that he would come and save his servant. And they, 4
when they came to Jesus, besought him earnestly, saying,

Palestine. 'The wady beds, dry and sandy most of the year but flooded after "the" rains. The wise builder chooses outcropping rock for his site. In Luke there is found only a vague description of a "flood," such as might happen anywhere' (Easton).

VII. 1–10. THE CENTURION AT CAPERNAUM

From Q: Matt. viii. 5 f.

Between the Sermon on the Mount and the Story of the Centurion Matthew places the account of a leper's healing which he takes from Mark. Luke has told this already in v. 12–16.

2. *centurion.* A Gentile—presumably in the service of Herod Antipas.

servant. Matthew uses a word which may mean 'son' or 'slave.' Luke interprets as 'slave' the word in the source he is using in common with Matthew. The centurion's concern is perhaps more natural if the object of it was his 'son' and not his 'slave': Luke seems to feel this when he inserts *who was dear unto him.* In John iv. 46 f., which may probably be a version of this story, the word 'son' is used.

3. The two 'deputations' sent by the centurion here and in *v.* 6 below are not mentioned by Matthew, in whose account the centurion himself comes to Jesus. The first is intelligible in itself and Luke may have derived it from tradition: the centurion employs the good offices of the most influential of his Jewish friends to urge his case. The second is less easy to understand. Luke is probably himself responsible for the alteration. His motive for the change has been variously interpreted. Loisy, who regards the incident as part of a largely fictitious prelude (together with the next event, at Nain) to the answer to John the Baptist's envoys in *v.* 22 below, thinks that Luke has borrowed from the Jairus story in viii. 40 f. Grieve (in *Peake's Commentary*) suggests that Luke desires to 'keep the Gentile centurion himself (as well as his servant) from contact with Jesus'—surely a most unlikely motive for Luke the Universalist. (A variant of this view is that to Luke the centurion was typical of later Gentile Christianity, which does not know Jesus 'after the flesh' but receives the Gospel through others. But the same objection applies.) Lagrange thinks that Luke felt that 'the centurion's humility would only be perfect if he did not even dare to appear.' This is perhaps in itself the most likely explanation, and is supported by *v.* 7 below.

5 He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him: for he
6 loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue. And
Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from
the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him,
Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou
7 shouldest come under my roof: wherefore neither thought
I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say the word, and
8 my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under
authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this
one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh;
9 and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. And when Jesus
heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned and said
unto the multitude that followed him, I say unto you, I have
10 not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they that
were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole.
11 And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went to a

5. Commentators quote other cases of generosity towards Jews from Gentiles.

8. *set under authority.* From the analogy of his own military authority the centurion believes in the power of Jesus to command, and exact obedience.

10. The cure at a distance is comparable to that of the Gentile woman's daughter in Mark vii. 24 f. Such cures are without any analogy in modern experience. Moreover, to say that Jesus 'healed with a word' is to introduce a magical idea unworthy of Him. What we know of the tendencies of first-century Christian thought leaves little room for doubt that the performance of the cure without the personal presence of Jesus is a later element in the story, introduced with the idea of increasing the wonder of the event—and thus, as it seemed, doing greater honour to Jesus.

11–17. THE WIDOW'S SON AT NAIN

Peculiar to Luke

The only two cases of raising from the dead, told of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, are the daughter of Jaïrus (viii. 40 f.) and this passage. Of those who feel that it is improbable, on general grounds, that Jesus did reanimate those who were actually lifeless, some may perhaps be content to explain these two cases as coma—a state of unconsciousness mistaken for death. [It is true enough that coma has often been mistaken for death—and in the East burial commonly follows quickly on death. Jesus' words of Jaïrus' daughter—'She is not dead, but sleepeth' (Luke viii. 52)—have been held to support this view.] Others, perhaps the majority, will feel that they are traditions, symbolic of the life-giving power of Jesus' words, which humble minds

city called Nain; and his disciples went with him, and a great multitude. Now when he drew near to the gate of the city, 12 behold, there was carried out one that was dead, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her. And when the Lord saw her, he 13 had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not. And 14 he came nigh and touched the bier: and the bearers stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. And 15 he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he gave him to his mother. And fear took hold on all: and they 16 glorified God, saying, A great prophet is arisen among us: and, God hath visited his people. And this report went forth 17 concerning him in the whole of Judæa, and all the region round about.

And the disciples of John told him of all these things. 18 And John calling unto him two of his disciples sent them to 19

offered to His memory as tokens of their worship. Similar stories are related of other great figures in popular religion.

In any case this story seems to depend partly upon the stories of Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kings xvii and 2 Kings iv. It should be noted that there is no mention of faith on the part of any character in the story.

11. *Nain.* This is usually identified with a modern village *Nein* 'on the N. slope of Little Hermon, 2 miles W. of Endor and about a day's 'ourney from Capernaum.' Josephus (*B.J.* IV. ix. 4) mentions a Nain on the E. side of Jordan: but the scene of this miracle seems to be laid in Galilee. That tradition is right in connecting *some* miracle with Nain is perhaps indicated by the fact that the village is not mentioned elsewhere in the Bible, and does not seem capable of allegorical interpretation.

13. *the Lord.* This title is frequently applied to Jesus by Luke: but not by Matthew or Mark. It is an indication how Christian thought as it reflected upon the ascended Jesus 'reacted upon the form of narratives describing His life on earth' (Creed).

17. *Judæa*: i.e. Palestine, iv. 44 note.

18–23. JOHN THE BAPTIST'S QUESTION

Matt. xi. 2 f.

18. Matthew has 'Now when John heard in the prison the works of the Christ.' Luke has already (in iii. 20) told that Herod put John in prison. Josephus says that John was imprisoned in the fort of Machaerus on the east of the Dead Sea.

19. There are two main lines of interpretation of John's question. The first assumes that John had recognised Jesus as Messiah from the

the Lord, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for
20 another? And when the men were come unto him, they said,
John the Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou
21 he that cometh, or look we for another? In that hour he
cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits; and on
22 many that were blind he bestowed sight. And he answered
and said unto them, Go your way, and tell John what things
ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the
lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the
dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to

first, and regards the question here as prompted by doubt or impatience: the second that John did not know that Jesus was Messiah, and that hope was the motive of his question. It seems clear (iii. 21 note) that the vision and voice at Jesus' Baptism came to Him only. A public proclamation of Jesus' Messiahship at the beginning of His work makes it almost impossible to understand the subsequent course of His Life: and there are several passages in the Gospels which shew that His Messiahship was not known (e.g. in particular Luke ix. 18 f.). Those who support the first view mentioned above seem to do so mainly because they are unwilling to sacrifice the historicity of such passages as Matt. iii. 14, 15 or John i. 29. It is wiser to recognise that in representing John as recognising Jesus' mission from the beginning Matthew and John 'give theory in dramatic form' (Creed).

On the second view John is hopeful but puzzled. He has heard of Jesus' miracles, which have led him to hope that Jesus may be 'He who was to come.' So he sends his friends to discover the truth from Jesus Himself.

he that cometh. This phrase goes back to John's words in iii. 16, 'there cometh he that is mightier than I'; and is best interpreted quite vaguely. 'It is only possible to say that John looked forward to an undefined but divinely sent Personality.' Some have thought Elijah is meant. 'The Apocalyptic conceptions of a Messiah were various and vague; much confusion existed as to the Messiah Himself and his forerunners; there were numerous Messianic figures, some of them forerunners of Yahweh Himself' (McNeile).

20, 21. These two verses are added by Luke, *v.* 21 to emphasise the point of Jesus' answer in *v.* 22 (but see note), *v.* 20 to lead up to *v.* 21.

22. The phrases of this answer of Jesus are reminiscent of various passages of Isaiah which were held to have Messianic significance. Cp. Isa. xxix. 18, 19, xxxv. 5, 6, lxi. 1. In the first of these passages the prophet speaks of the deaf hearing and the blind seeing, in a spiritual sense: in the second of the healing of blind, deaf, lame and dumb, probably literally: the third is quoted by Jesus at Nazareth in Luke iv. 18, and from it comes the phrase that is the culminating point of Jesus' answer here, *the poor have good tidings preached to them.* Thus Jesus' answer would clearly convey the meaning that the time of Messianic salvation had come.

them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion 23
of stumbling in me.

And when the messengers of John were departed, he began 24
to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye

But the sense of Jesus' words in themselves admits of an important difference of interpretation. Is Jesus in His answer to John appealing to His *miracles* as His Messianic credentials?—this view Luke clearly takes in *v.* 21—or is He using the words in the metaphorical sense in which some of them at least were used by Isaiah, thus referring to His *teaching* and its results as proofs of His Messiahship—a sense which is possible in Matthew's version, though no doubt Matthew himself held the same view as Luke? There is much to be said for the latter interpretation, although it is not that of the evangelists. (It may have been that of Q.) That Jesus should have appealed to His miracles as evidence of His Messiahship seems strikingly inconsistent with His usual attitude towards miracles (cp. iv. 43 note), and His desire for secrecy about them. It would be quite in keeping with His character and with His own view of His Mission that He should here lay stress on teaching as His main work. It should also be noticed that miracles of healing were not, so far as is known, among the expected works of Messiah. Moreover, such miracles were related of the great O.T. prophets. The argument from them would not therefore be a forcible one to John. That from the spiritual awakening which Jesus was bringing about would, on the contrary, have special weight with John—of whose message repentance had been the central theme. 'Go and tell John that the people are stirring from their stupor of moral disease and blindness and hardness of hearing, their hearts are being purified, there is new life among them, to the oppressed and hopeless good news has come.'

23. This verse might be a general statement continuing the previous verse—'and blessed is he who recognises the new truth and light.' But it seems more probable that it was intended to have definite reference to John himself, partly indeed as a rebuke. 'Blessed is he who does not find an occasion for offence in My not conforming to his own ideas of Messiah, but recognises that the bringing of spiritual light and truth is Messiah's true work.' Perhaps Jesus felt that He was not likely to convince John.

24–28. JESUS' ESTIMATE OF JOHN

Matthew xi. 7 f.

It has been suggested that the whole tone of this passage is that of a funeral oration, and that it was really spoken later, after John's death. This may be true of three verses in Matthew's account (Matt. xi. 12–14) which Luke does not reproduce here. But the tone of the passage is sufficiently explained by the fact that John's work was over and his death near.

out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the
25 wind? But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft
raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and
26 live delicately, are in kings' courts. But what went ye out
to see? a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more
27 than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written,

Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
Who shall prepare thy way before thee.

28 I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there
is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the

24. *a reed shaken with the wind?* Most commentators take this in a symbolical sense and regard it as meaning a weak and fickle person. This would point the contrast with the uncompromising ruggedness of John's character, but it is not so natural, and does not lead up to the next verse so well as the literal interpretation. 'You did not put yourselves out by journeying into the desert, merely to look at the scenery—to see the everyday sight of reeds moving in the breeze. You could see that any day on the Jordan banks.' The question supplies its own negative answer.

25. 'It was not to see fine clothes that you went out. Such a sight might well have attracted you, but you would not go to the desert to find it.'

26. 'No, it was to see a prophet that you went eagerly out into the desert—a prophet, and much more.'

27. Malachi iii. 1. This is quoted also by Mark (i. 2), where it is, incidentally, attributed to Isaiah. All the Gospel versions of this prophecy differ from the O.T. in several points. The most important differences are that they say '*before thy face*' instead of 'before me'; and '*thy way*' instead of 'the way before me.'

The change of interpretation produced by this version of the prophecy is sufficiently remarkable. In Malachi the words are spoken by God of His own forerunner—possibly Elijah: 'I will send my messenger to prepare the way before *me*.' Here the words are taken as spoken by God to the Messiah of Messiah's herald. The prophecy would obviously not have been quoted in this way by Jesus Himself.

28. The comparative has a superlative force. For all his greatness as the climax of the Old Order, John had not the spiritual privileges of a humble member of the New. So great was the gulf between the two. The saying is perhaps as likely to be the product of later reflection on history as to have been said by Jesus Himself. 'There seems to have been a tendency in early Christian literature to rewrite the story of John the Baptist, so as to bring him into conscious subordination to Jesus' (*B. of C.* I, p. 109).

29–30. THE RECEPTION OF JOHN'S PREACHING

These verses are probably to be regarded as a parenthesis in the middle of Jesus' speech. It has been suggested that they are intended

kingdom of God is greater than he. And all the people when 29
they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized
with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers 30
rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized
of him. Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this genera- 31
tion, and to what are they like? They are like unto children 32
that sit in the marketplace, and call one to another; which
say, We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed,
and ye did not weep. For John the Baptist is come eating 33

to be part of Jesus' words, but their awkwardness (e.g. the unexpected use by Jesus of the phrase *the people*) is against this.

29. *all*: to be taken, as usually in Luke, with a grain of salt.

when they heard (the preaching of John).

justified God, being baptized.... 'Admitted the righteousness of God (in making these claims upon them and granting them these opportunities) *by* being baptised' (Plummer). 'Acknowledged John's Divine mission.'

30. *rejected for themselves*...: 'Frustrated God's plan for themselves.'

31–35. THE CHILDREN'S GAMES

Matt. xi. 16 f.

31, 32. This passage has suffered much at the hands of commentators. Jesus speaks from the experience of His own childhood in children's games. The first principle therefore in the interpretation of the verses must be that the game represented in them should be one that children would naturally play. How far this has been lost sight of may be seen from the note of a recent English commentator: 'The children may have sat in two rows facing one another, and chanting rhymed responses. How the game proceeded we cannot imagine.' It does not require much imagination or knowledge of children to see that such a game would never have begun.

The idea in Jesus' mind seems to be that of children playing at weddings and funerals. They squabble, and end by playing neither. The main thought is clear. The Jewish leaders accepted neither John with his asceticism nor Jesus with His message of joy. But the words admit of different interpretations in detail. Thus: (1) there are two groups of children. Some want a wedding, some a funeral. They cannot agree and sit down and shriek at each other. In this case there is no strict allegorical comparison to the Jews and Jesus and John—it is the attitude of the children as a whole that illustrates the attitude of the Jews towards both. (2) There are two groups of children. One invites the other to play, first at a funeral, then at a wedding. The second group will not play at either, but sits in sulky refusal. In this case the first group will represent first John, then Jesus: and the second the Jews.

33, 34. 'John's teaching was stern and gloomy, and you say "He

no bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil.
34 The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say,
Behold, a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of
35 publicans and sinners! And wisdom is justified of all her
children.
36 And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat
with him. And he entered into the Pharisee's house, and sat

is mad": Jesus' is full of love and joy, and you say "How weak and unprincipled."'

33. *He hath a devil.* John's inspiration and asceticism implied something more than human: the Jews prefer to ascribe it to possession by a demon rather than the power of God. Faced with the same dilemma with regard to Jesus' healing work (chapter xi), they give the same answer 'By the prince of the devils he casteth out devils.'

34. Cp. v. 27–35 notes. It is not difficult to understand what a stumbling-block in the way of accepting Him as Messiah Jesus' attitude towards ritual observance would be to the sincere Pharisee. He was not 'respectable.'

35. Luke has *of all her children*, instead of Matthew's 'by her works.' 'Wisdom' is, as often in Hebrew literature, a personification of God. 'The children of wisdom' are those who have accepted John and Jesus. The Greek word for 'and' here has an adversative force. 'And yet the Wisdom of God has been shewn to be right by all those who have accepted Her messengers.' This is the usual explanation. Is it possible that Jesus uses 'children' here of Himself and John? 'Yet the Wisdom of God is shewn to be right in all Her children,' i.e. 'Yet both John and I, though so different, have our part in God's plan.' This suits the context well but perhaps lays too much stress on Luke's 'all.'

36–50. THE ANOINTING IN SIMON'S HOUSE

Cp. Matt. xxvi. 6–13; Mark xiv. 3–9; John xii. 1–8

The problem of the relation of the story Luke gives here with the passages in the other Gospels given above is a complicated one, in which certainty is not attainable. Matthew and Mark describe an anointing of Jesus' head by an unnamed woman at Bethany in the house of 'Simon the Leper.' They place this on the day before Jesus' arrest. John gives, 'six days before the Passover,' an account of an anointing of Jesus' feet by Mary at Bethany. John's account is similar to Luke's in several details: and seems to be a combination of Mark and Luke (Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 402).

On internal evidence Stanton regards the passage in Luke as 'one that was composed by the evangelist himself on the basis of oral tradition.' Of *vv.* 37, 38 he says: 'A long but admirably constructed sentence, such as no N.T. writer save the author of Luke and Acts has shewn himself capable of composing'—and throughout he finds detailed Lucan characteristics (Stanton, *Gospels as Hist. Doc.* II, pp.

down to meat. And behold, a woman which was in the city, 37
a sinner; and when she knew that he was sitting at meat in
the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster cruse of oint-
ment, and standing behind at his feet, weeping, she began 38
to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair
of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the
ointment. Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him 39
saw it, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were
a prophet, would have perceived who and what manner of
woman this is which toucheth him, that she is a sinner.

298–9). It should also be noticed that the Parable of the Two Debtors, although incontestably characteristic of Jesus, does not fit the context in which it is placed (note on *v.* 47 below). Besides this, the Pharisee's behaviour is not convincing, *vv.* 44–46 note. The context of the passage as a whole, on the contrary, is excellent as an illustration of the attitude described in *v.* 34.

These facts are on the whole best covered by holding that Luke was influenced by a desire to provide an example of the Pharisaic attitude towards Jesus as the friend of publicans and sinners, and did so by combining the short parable of the Two Debtors, which came to him by tradition or in his peculiar source, with material borrowed from Mark's story of the anointing at Bethany (which Luke accordingly omits later on), and possibly from other contexts in Mark also.

36. Luke alone speaks of invitations by Pharisees (xi. 37, xiv. 1). There is no reason to attribute a sinister motive to Simon in inviting Jesus, though he does not seem to have treated Him with great courtesy (*vv.* 44–46 below).

37. *a sinner.* Luke does not say definitely that she was a prostitute, but his general expression seems to favour that view. (An Eastern house would be open to the street so that beggars or other strangers could easily find their way in.) The word appears to go naturally with *in the city* and thus to imply that she was known to be 'a sinner.' It is quite impossible to put a name to the 'city.'

an alabaster cruse of ointment: 'a phial of ointment.' Unguent-boxes or phials were called *alabastra*, which is the Greek word here, even when not made of alabaster.

38. *standing behind at his feet.* The guests lay on the elbow towards the table, with their feet behind them. The woman comes up behind Jesus.

with the hair of her head. It was considered disgraceful among the Jews for a woman to appear with hair unbound. Commentators therefore regard her as sacrificing her shame for her love of Jesus in letting down her hair. But if she was a prostitute, her hair may well have been unbound when she entered the house.

39. 'No true prophet would let himself be defiled by touching such a woman' thinks the Pharisee.

40 And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat
41 to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on. A certain
lender had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence,
42 and the other fifty. When they had not *wherewith* to pay, he
forgave them both. Which of them therefore will love him
43 most? Simon answered and said, He, I suppose, to whom he
forgave the most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly
44 judged. And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon,
Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou
gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath wetted my
45 feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. Thou
gavest me no kiss: but she, since the time I came in, hath
46 not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not
47 anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with ointment. Where-
fore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven;
for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, *the same*

40. Jesus reads His host's thought, perhaps through a look or the expression on his face, and calls his attention to Himself.

41. *five hundred pence...fifty.* The *denarius* was at the time of Jesus $\frac{1}{25}$ of the *aureus*, the Roman gold coin, and its value would thus be roughly 9½*d.* in our money. But it appears to have been the day's wage of a labourer (Matt. xx. 2) and of a Roman soldier (Tac. *Ann.* I. 17. 8, quoted by Plummer). Several commentators thus regard it as having had more purchasing power than its nominal value. 'Shilling' is a more accurate translation. The point here is not so much the actual value of the debts as the fact that one was ten times as big as the other.

44–46. The host had failed to perform the commonest acts of courtesy towards his guest: the outcast woman had abundantly supplied them all. *Why,* after inviting Jesus, the Pharisee should not have treated Him with courtesy, is not clear.

47. The first half of this verse, if naturally translated, is at variance with the parable given above. For the point of the parable is that great forgiveness produces great love: while the point here, which is obviously appropriate to the situation, is that great love produces great forgiveness. The second half suits the parable, but not the situation.

In order to avoid these contradictions, and also in some cases from a reluctance to admit the principle that love is a justification for forgiveness, many commentators assume that the woman had previously repented (either through Jesus' preaching, or at the moment when she came into the house) and that her actions were the expression of the love and gratitude she felt for the assurance of forgiveness she had then received. 'Jesus now confirms her assurance and publicly declares her forgiveness.' They translate: 'Therefore, as you may conclude from the fact that she has shewn so much love, I tell you her sins which

loveth little. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. 48
And they that sat at meat with him began to say within 49
themselves, Who is this that even forgiveth sins? And he 50
said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.

And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about 8
through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good
tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve,
and certain women which had been healed of evil spirits and 2
infirmities, Mary that was called Magdalene, from whom

were many have been forgiven.' The second half of the verse will then follow naturally, 'One to whom less had been forgiven would not have shewn so much love'—Simon's lack of love shewed that he had felt no repentance or forgiveness. Verse 48 is the public declaration of a fact already accomplished, and realised by the woman.

But this explanation involves an entirely unnatural translation of the simple words in *v.* 47*a*, and in other ways raises as many difficulties as it solves. (She may, of course, have seen Jesus, and been profoundly affected by Him, before.)

It is simpler to recognise, as was suggested in the note at the beginning of the section, the composite nature of the passage, and not to attempt to resolve the contradictions. The parable, with its thought that great forgiveness produces great love, is, as has been said, characteristic of Jesus: and, in spite of much Pauline and Protestant theology, one cannot help feeling that Jesus might well regard great love as a just ground for great forgiveness. But Luke has been ill-advised to combine the two thoughts here, for they are not logically connected. The second half of *v.* 47 will thus be regarded as irrelevant to its context—an amplification of the idea of the parable. The first half will bear its natural meaning, 'Her great love has won forgiveness for her.' Verse 48 tells the woman of her forgiveness.

49. Cp. v. 21 f. Luke may have taken the verse from that passage.

50. Cp. viii. 48, where the same words are used to the woman with the issue of blood. Commentators explain the words as meaning that the woman's spiritual faith had secured her forgiveness: i.e. that—as was undoubtedly true, if Luke's version of the anointing is in any sense historical—it was the attractiveness and power of Jesus' personality that had impelled her to come to Him and awakened her devotion. But it is perhaps simpler to regard the verse as borrowed from the incident in chapter viii, where it has an undeniable appropriateness.

VIII. 1–3. THE WOMEN FRIENDS OF JESUS

These three verses are peculiar to Luke, and exhibit the sympathy towards women which is characteristic of his Gospel. Stanton finds 'many Lucan characteristics in this short passage,' and regards it as composed by Luke himself from oral tradition.

2. *Magdalene.* It is not quite certain that the word is a place-name,

3 seven devils had gone out, and Joanna the wife of Chuza
Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which
ministered unto them of their substance.
4 And when a great multitude came together, and they of
5 every city resorted unto him, he spake by a parable: The
sower went forth to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell
by the way side; and it was trodden under foot, and the
6 birds of the heaven devoured it. And other fell on the rock;
and as soon as it grew, it withered away, because it had no

but if it is it means 'of Magdala,' a town to the S.W. of the Sea of Galilee near Tiberias. Magdala appears in A.V. at Matt. xv. 39, but this is an inferior reading.

seven devils had gone out. 'To Luke possession was a simple reality: he affirms it more confidently than the other Evangelists' (Wright). The phrase expresses the violence of the madness that had possessed her.

3. *Joanna*: mentioned again in xxiv. 10.

Chuza Herod's steward. His position was probably more important than merely 'house-steward.' Lagrange quotes from Josephus the use of the same title of one Syllaeus at the court of king Aretas who is elsewhere called the king's 'brother,' i.e. confidential minister. For Luke's knowledge of Herod's household compare Acts xiii. 1, 'Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod.' Cf. also Luke xxiii. 7–12.

ministered unto them of their substance. This explains, at least partially, how Jesus and His disciples were provided with means of livelihood. It appears to have been not unusual for wealthy women to support Rabbis. Possibly an abuse of this is referred to in xx. 47.

4–8. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

Mark iv. 1 f.; Matthew xiii. 1 f.

At vi. 20 Luke left Mark's narrative (at Mark iii. 19), and returns to it again here. But he omits, as one might expect, the attempt to seize Jesus on the ground of madness (Mark iii. 20–21), while giving its sequel (Mark iii. 31–35) at viii. 19–21: and introduces later (xi. 14 f.) a somewhat different version of the rest of Mark's chapter iii, derived from Q. Thus he here takes up Mark at iv. 1: but abbreviates his account somewhat in the next few sections. Matthew and Mark give this parable as the first of a group.

5. The parable may have been suggested to Jesus, or illustrated by Him to the crowd, by a sower sowing near.

it was trodden under foot. Luke adds this. As Lagrange says, the 'way side' was presumably merely a field-path, but Luke seems to regard it as having considerable traffic on it.

6. *rock.* Mark speaks of rocky ground covered with a little soil. Luke greatly shortens what Mark says about the seed springing up quickly because it had no depth of earth, and so being withered by

moisture. And other fell amidst the thorns; and the thorns 7
grew with it, and choked it. And other fell into the good 8
ground, and grew, and brought forth fruit a hundredfold.
As he said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear,
let him hear.

And his disciples asked him what this parable might be. 9
And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of 10

the sun. Some think that Luke did not understand quite what Mark meant: others that he is using a shorter original version which Mark had expanded. In any case his abbreviation rather spoils the point of *v.* 13 (below) in the interpretation of the parable.

7. *amidst the thorns; and the thorns grew with it.* Mark 'among the thorns, and the thorns grew up.' Mark's words may have seemed to Luke a little inconsequent. The thorns were presumably already above ground when the seed fell among them. What Luke writes removes the contradiction. The seed fell in the middle of the thorns, and when the corn grew the thorns got entangled with it ('grew together' in the literal sense, not 'sprang up together') and choked it.

8. *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.* This call to thought and attention occurs several times in the Gospels, after parabolic or symbolic sayings; cp. Matt. xi. 15, xiii. 43.

9–10. THE REASON FOR PARABLES

Mark iv. 10 f.; Matthew xiii. 10 f.

9–10. Two views have been held of this passage:

(1) Jesus has been regarded as having intended His parables to prevent the unsympathetic from understanding. 'As hostility increases the parabolic method is more used, because it reveals only to those in sympathy and anxious to learn' (Ragg). 'A parable has a double use; it tends to vail and it tends to illustrate a truth' (Bacon). Jesus then intended the parables to reveal truth to the sympathetic, to conceal it from the hostile.

(2) The words are the product of later thought, due to the fact that Christians of the generation after Jesus came to regard the parables 'not as helpful illustrations but as "dark sayings"' (Smith, *St Matthew*, p. 136) which required allegorical interpretation; and concluded that their obscurity was intentional. This would be natural enough if a parable which was intended to illustrate one single point—many of the details being simply part of the 'setting'—was regarded as an allegory in which a symbolic meaning must be found for every detail. The 'explanations' of certain parables given in the Gospels illustrate the process (cp. *vv.* 11–15 below).

The naturally exclusive feeling which membership of a society tends to produce in its members towards those outside may also have contributed to this. Christians a generation after Jesus may well have felt it right and natural that Jesus should have adopted a method of teaching which would have prevented the unsympathetic from knowing

the kingdom of God: but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.

the precious truths that they themselves—the 'elect'—had been given grace to learn. When this stage of reasoning had been reached, support for it would naturally have been sought in the O.T.—and found in the passage quoted from Isaiah.

The first view seems impossible for two reasons. First, Jesus appears to have used the parabolic method of teaching from the very beginning of His Ministry, before there was any hostility to guard against. Protection from the unsympathetic could not therefore have been the motive for its use. Secondly, and more important, it is hard to conceive of Jesus having wished to prevent *anyone* from understanding, however prejudiced or hostile. And as a matter of fact it does not seem likely that the parables of Jesus, to judge from those that have come down to us, would have had that result. They are not complicated allegories, but simple illustrations taken from everyday life. In their full context, without the obscurities acquired in the course of centuries of tradition, with the object that had suggested the comparison in view, perhaps pointed out by Jesus, they must have been even more illuminating than they are to-day. Illustration, moreover, has always been the method of any teacher worthy of the name: and story-telling is still the habit of the Eastern peoples. Thus it would really have been extraordinary if Jesus had *not* taught by means of parables.

11–15. THE MEANING OF THE PARABLE

Mark iv. 13 f.; Matthew xiii. 18 f.

That these 'explanations' of parables—cp. in Matt. xiii, the Tares and the Net—'belong to a time when their original application has been forgotten and every detail is regarded as significant' (Smith) is now widely accepted. Cp. note on *vv.* 9–10 above. It is, of course, possible and natural that Jesus should have spared no pains to make the meaning of His teaching clear to the Twelve—but the words in which He did it have not come down to us. Of this explanation Smith goes on to say: 'Here the sower is the Christian missionary in a time when persecution is possible because of the Word; the seed is the gospel, containing within itself the embryo plant, Christian lives; the soil is the heart of the hearers, which may be hardened and so incapable of supporting spiritual life, or shallow, able only to support life for a time under favourable circumstances, or already too thickly sown with weeds, or good soil, from which spring fruitful Christian lives, some more fruitful than others' (p. 138).

Without any context it is impossible to be certain just what this parable—and some others—was originally meant to teach. Possibly the lesson may have been somewhat different for the crowd and for the Twelve. Thus to the Twelve (especially as it stands in Mark, followed by the parables of the Seed growing secretly and the Mustard-seed) it may have been designed to bring encouragement in spite of apparently disappointing results. The result of their work depends

Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. 11
And those by the way side are they that have heard; then 12
cometh the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart,
that they may not believe and be saved. And those on the rock 13
are they which, when they have heard, receive the word with
joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and
in time of temptation fall away. And that which fell among 14
the thorns, these are they that have heard, and as they go
on their way they are choked with cares and riches and
pleasures of *this* life, and bring no fruit to perfection. And 15
that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and
good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring
forth fruit with patience.

And no man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it 16
with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but putteth it on
a stand, that they which enter in may see the light. For 17
nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor *anything*
secret, that shall not be known and come to light. Take heed 18

upon the character of those who hear; but (the Seed growing secretly) God is behind them, and if they do their best they can leave the rest to Him; and moreover (the Mustard-seed) small beginnings may produce astonishingly great results. To the crowd the story would have had a different emphasis. It is not enough to hear—they must bear fruit. The word depends for its effects upon their own efforts and determination.

11. *the word of God.* Luke means by this phrase the preaching of Jesus or of later Christian times.

13. Luke has not here altered Mark to suit his own alteration in *v.* 6.

15. *bring forth fruit with patience.* Mark 'bear fruit, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.' Luke replaces Mark's somewhat mechanical conclusion by words which express admirably the lesson of the parable.

16–18. THE LAMP

Mark iv. 21 f.

The fact that these three verses recur in later chapters of Luke in different contexts shews that they stood in Q as well as in Mark (from whom Luke takes them here). [Matthew omits them in the Marcan context but takes them from Q. Yet even so Matthew's contexts for them are not parallel to Luke's, so very probably the sayings had no definitely marked appropriateness to their context in Q.] Thus *v.* 16 = xi. 33; *v.* 17 = xii. 2; *v.* 18 = xix. 26. It is evident therefore that too much importance need not be attached to Mark's context for them here. But if it is the correct one, a good sense can be obtained

therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he thinketh he hath.

19 And there came to him his mother and brethren, and they
20 could not come at him for the crowd. And it was told him,
Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see
21 thee. But he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it.

thus: (*v.* 16) 'The lamp of knowledge that I have lit in you,' says Jesus, 'you must not hide, but let it be seen far and wide. (*v.* 17) There is no corner so dark that its light will not illuminate it if you use it well. (*v.* 18) Put your whole mind into understanding what I tell you: for heaven helps those who help themselves.' The later Lucan contexts for these verses are on the whole easier—but not very convincing even so.

18. *for whosoever hath etc.* This applies equally to knowledge or opportunity. Knowledge well learnt, or opportunities well used, lead on to more: neglect to learn or use brings inability. In this context the emphasis is on knowledge—in xix. 26 on the use of opportunity: see also note there.

19–21. JESUS' MOTHER AND BROTHERS

Mark iii. 31–35; Matt. xii. 46–50

Luke places this incident after, instead of, as in Mark, before the parable of the Sower. He has shortened it, and altered it to make it suit its new position (note on *v.* 21). It should be noticed that in Mark the passage comes a few verses after the attempts to seize Jesus on the part of His family, Mark iii. 20–21 (omitted, through dislike of it, by both Matthew and Luke), which explains Jesus' severity towards them. Luke's alteration leaves this unexplained—as well as the reason for the family's coming.

19. *his...brethren*: i.e. the younger sons of Mary and Joseph. The other two theories about them—(1) that they were children of Joseph by a former wife, (2) that they were cousins of Jesus—would never have arisen but for theological ideas with regard to the perpetual virginity of Mary—ideas which rested upon the view that marriage was in itself degrading. There is no evidence whatever in the Gospels for these theories. From Mark vi. 3 we see that their names are James, Joses, Judas and Simon: at least two sisters are mentioned there also, so the family must have numbered seven or more.

for the crowd. Luke has taken this detail from Mark, but it does not fit the altered position of the incident, for the teaching in the previous verses has been given to the Twelve only. In Mark the crowd is gathered round the house where Jesus is (Mark iii. 20).

21. 'My mother and brothers? *All* of you are as dear to Me as mother or brother or sister, if you do God's will.'

hear. By adding this word Luke makes this verse an appropriate

Now it came to pass on one of those days, that he entered 22
into a boat, himself and his disciples; and he said unto them,
Let us go over unto the other side of the lake: and they
launched forth. But as they sailed he fell asleep: and there 23
came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filling
with water, and were in jeopardy. And they came to him, 24
and awoke him, saying, Master, master, we perish. And he
awoke, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water:
and they ceased, and there was a calm. And he said unto 25
them, Where is your faith? And being afraid they marvelled,
saying one to another, Who then is this, that he commandeth
even the winds and the water, and they obey him?

conclusion to the parable of the Sower. No doubt this was why he put the passage here. Hearers of the word who go on to be doers of it are joined to Jesus by a spiritual tie that is stronger and more lasting than even the closest bonds of physical relationship.

22–25. THE STORM

Mark iv. 35–41; Matt. viii. 23–27

23. *there came down a storm of wind*—from the heights which surround the lake. 'These are furrowed with ravines like funnels, down which winds rush with great velocity' (Plummer).

For the general characteristics of this and the two following stories see additional note at the end of this chapter. If a foundation in fact is sought for this incident on the lake, it may lie in the impression made upon the disciples by Jesus' calmness in the midst of a storm. 'Sudden calms are as common on the sea of Galilee as sudden storms' (Easton).

26–39. THE DEMONIAC AND THE SWINE

Mark v. 1–20; Matt. viii. 28–34

The difficulty of this strange story is well known. Four questions may be asked, to which, if the story is accepted as it stands, no really satisfactory answer can be given: (1) Are we to think of the devils (which to-day we should call the spirit of madness) as personal spirits capable of transferring themselves from men to animals? (2) Why did Jesus destroy innocent animals, when, as is evident elsewhere, He had such a love for Nature and everything living? (3) What justification can be found for this destruction of the property of others? (4) Why did He do something immediately He arrived on the other side of the lake which effectually prevented Him from teaching the people there, and compelled Him to cross the lake again? To the first question only those who regard the 'evil spirits' of the Gospel as having a separate personal existence will answer in the affirmative. To the others various answers are attempted by those who defend the story as it stands:

26 And they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which
27 is over against Galilee. And when he was come forth upon
the land, there met him a certain man out of the city, who
had devils; and for a long time he had worn no clothes, and
28 abode not in *any* house, but in the tombs. And when he saw

as, for instance, 'A visible effect of the departure of the demons was necessary to convince the demoniac and his neighbours of the completeness of the cure'—'The keepers of the swine were Jews who were thus breaking the Jewish Law'—'Jesus had not time Himself to preach in this district, and therefore commissioned the demoniac in this way as His messenger.' None of these—which are the least artificial of many—are convincing answers. Are we to imagine Jesus endorsing the doctrine of doing evil that good may come, and why was anything more convincing needed than the change from madness to quietness in the demoniac himself? It is not likely that the keepers were Jews (the population to the east of Jordan was largely heathen)—and in any case it was not the fault of the swine. To destroy a person's property is not the best way to induce him to listen to a message.

The story may be regarded simply as 'a popular tale which in some way that cannot now be recovered came to be attached to Jesus' (Creed). If it is regarded as having some foundation in fact, clearly the healing of the madman and the destruction of the swine were not directly connected. Whether the drowning of the swine was a mere coincidence, or more probably the demoniac or the bystanders frightened them—the swineherds may have left them to come and watch Jesus and the madman—onlookers who held the vivid belief of the day in demons and demoniac possession would conclude that the demons had found a new home, and describe the incident accordingly. The swineherds would also be naturally anxious to put the blame on somebody else. Cp. *By an Unknown Disciple* (Hodder and Stoughton), chap. I.

26. *Gerasenes*: some MSS read 'Gergesenes,' and some 'Gadarenes.' The city of Gadara is several miles distant from the lake and could not therefore have been actually the scene of the event, though it might have given its name to the district. Gerasa is 30 miles S.E. of the lake —a large and important city in Decapolis. It also *might* have given its name to the district. The reading Gergesa is due to the influence of Origen, who was shewn the traditional site of the event on the shore of the lake and altered the reading in his MSS of Matthew. The modern name of the village which has been identified as the scene—the only place, apparently, on the east side of the lake which answers to the description—is *Khersa* or *Chersa*, which might be represented by 'Gergesa' in Greek. Others think that *Chersa* was represented by Gerasa in our Gospels, which is therefore the true reading but nothing to do with the Gerasa in Decapolis.

27. *in the tombs*. 'Near the ruins of *Khersa* there are many tombs hewn in the rocks' (Plummer).

28. For the recognition of Jesus by the demoniac see note on iv. 34.

Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I beseech thee, torment me not. For he commanded the unclean spirit to come out from the 29
man. For oftentimes it had seized him: and he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters; and breaking the bands asunder, he was driven of the devil into the deserts. And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? And he said, 30
Legion; for many devils were entered into him. And they 31
intreated him that he would not command them to depart into the abyss. Now there was there a herd of many swine 32
feeding on the mountain: and they intreated him that he would give them leave to enter into them. And he gave them leave. And the devils came out from the man, and entered 33
into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the lake, and were choked. And when they that fed them saw 34
what had come to pass, they fled, and told it in the city and

According to Josephus 'the Most High' was a recognised title among Gentiles for the God of the Jews.

30. According to popular ideas of exorcism it was necessary to discover the demon's name. An interesting note on this point will be found on p. 160 of *Peake's Commentary* in connection with the wrestling of Jacob in Gen. xxxii. (Cp. Wesley's well-known hymn, 'I will not let Thee go unless | Thou tell Thy name to me.') 'The name is, to primitive thought, an essential part of the personality: to know it is to get its bearer into one's power....' Cp. the phrase 'in the name of Jesus' in Acts. Deissmann (quoted by Ragg) gives a sentence from an ancient text, *The Great Magical Papyrus*, 'I adjure thee, every daemonic spirit, say whatsoever thou art.' Cp. next note.

Legion. The strength of a legion was nominally 6000. The word might well have a sinister sound to the inhabitants of Palestine at the time of Jesus, oppressed as they were from time to time by the Roman soldiers. It would give the impression of irresistible and ruthless power, as well as of number. The demon evades the question and answers, according to Mark's version, with grim humour, 'Legion is my name, for we are many.'

31. *into the abyss.* Mark 'out of the country.' In the O.T. 'the abyss' means 'the depths' of sea or earth: in the N.T. it is the place of spirits (Rom. x. 7) and more particularly of evil spirits (Rev. ix. 1, 2, 11). Luke perhaps uses it here because the spirits were eventually to plunge into 'the depths' of the lake—or perhaps because he regards what Mark says as rather pointless, and puts into the demon's mouth what he considers a more appropriately demonic request.

33. *the herd.* Mark says 'about two thousand.'

35 in the country. And they went out to see what had come to
pass; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, from whom
the devils were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right
36 mind, at the feet of Jesus: and they were afraid. And they
that saw it told them how he that was possessed with devils
37 was made whole. And all the people of the country of the
Gerasenes round about asked him to depart from them; for
they were holden with great fear: and he entered into a boat,
38 and returned. But the man from whom the devils were gone
out prayed him that he might be with him: but he sent him
39 away, saying, Return to thy house, and declare how great
things God hath done for thee. And he went his way,
publishing throughout the whole city how great things Jesus
had done for him.

40 And as Jesus returned, the multitude welcomed him; for
41 they were all waiting for him. And behold, there came a
man named Jaïrus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and
he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him to come into
42 his house; for he had an only daughter, about twelve years
of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the multitudes
thronged him.

43 And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which

35. *the man...gone out.* This is Luke's more correct description of the man after he was healed. Mark still calls him 'the demoniac.'

37. *all the people.* A characteristic Lucan amplification of Mark's simple 'they.'

for they were holden.... Luke adds this phrase as a reason, almost an excuse perhaps, for their action.

39. Contrast the orders for silence given on other occasions. There were no enemies here: Jesus was out of Herod's dominions and therefore safe from misrepresentation and violence; and the man might do some useful missionary work among those who would not otherwise hear the message.

throughout the whole city. Mark 'in Decapolis.' Perhaps, as Lagrange suggests, Luke and his readers were not interested in Decapolis (or did not understand the name).

40–56. JAÏRUS' DAUGHTER AND THE WOMAN IN THE CROWD

Mark v. 21–43; Matt. ix. 18–26

42. *only.* Luke only, as in vii. 12 and ix. 38. Luke seems to have added the detail to make the story more touching.

43. *having an issue of blood*: 'being in a state of haemorrhage.'

had spent all her living upon physicians, and could not be healed of any, came behind him, and touched the border of 44
his garment: and immediately the issue of her blood stanched.
And Jesus said, Who is it that touched me? And when all 45
denied, Peter said, and they that were with him, Master, the
multitudes press thee and crush *thee*. But Jesus said, Some 46
one did touch me: for I perceived that power had gone forth
from me. And when the woman saw that she was not hid, 47

twelve years: so Mark also here, but Luke is accustomed to add the duration of diseases himself (cp. xiii. 16; Acts iii. 2, ix. 33).

had spent all her living upon physicians: these words, which are parallel to Mark, are omitted by some of the best MSS in Luke, and are probably an assimilation to Mark's text (see next note).

could not be healed of any. Luke's treatment of the passage is perhaps significant. Mark has 'who had suffered greatly at the hands of many doctors and had spent her all, and was no better but rather worse.' If we accept the omission of 'had spent... physicians' in Luke (see last note), Luke has omitted all Mark's strictures on the medical profession and contented himself with the simple statement that the woman's case was incurable. One who was not a doctor himself might perhaps have so treated Mark's text in the interests of brevity; but it is possible to recognise here Luke's loyalty to his profession—especially as, in spite of his tendency to shorten Mark, Luke is not inclined to minimise but rather to emphasise the severity of an affliction, in order to increase the wonder of the cure.

44. *behind*: because her disease made her ceremonially unclean, so that her touch would bring defilement. She thought Jesus would be angry if she tried to touch Him.

border. The word means the tassel hanging down behind at the corner of the garment. 'The square overgarment had tassels of three white threads with one of hyacinth at each of the four corners' (Plummer).

With regard to the manner of the woman's cure H. G. Wood (in *Peake's Commentary*) says: 'The description of the woman... and the account of her healing by the transference of some mysterious power through physical contact, belong to the circle of ideas current among peasants and humble folk' (cp. Acts v. 15, Peter's shadow; Acts xix. 12, Paul's handkerchiefs). If the story is founded on fact, the cure itself may be explained by auto-suggestion—the strength of the woman's conviction that if she touched Jesus she would be healed, which was strong enough to heal her. But Jesus' words in *v.* 46, and the magical element referred to in the comment just quoted, are in any case clearly legendary.

45. Luke has rewritten Mark's account here perhaps because he feels that the disciples' words to Jesus in Mark are not respectful enough. Luke makes Peter the spokesman.

47. Mark simply says 'told him all the truth.' Luke expands this to emphasise the publicity and speed of the cure.

she came trembling, and falling down before him declared
in the presence of all the people for what cause she touched
48 him, and how she was healed immediately. And he said unto
her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.
49 While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the
synagogue's *house*, saying, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not
50 the Master. But Jesus hearing it, answered him, Fear not:
51 only believe, and she shall be made whole. And when he
came to the house, he suffered not any man to enter in with
him, save Peter, and John, and James, and the father of the
52 maiden and her mother. And all were weeping, and bewailing
her: but he said, Weep not; for she is not dead, but sleepeth.
53 And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead.
54 But he, taking her by the hand, called, saying, Maiden, arise.
55 And her spirit returned, and she rose up immediately: and
56 he commanded that *something* be given her to eat. And her
parents were amazed: but he charged them to tell no man
what had been done.

52. *she is not dead, but sleepeth.* Some have attempted to explain away the miraculous implication by taking these words literally. Apparently this was so even in Luke's time, for he adds in the next verse *knowing that she was dead.* But there is surely no possible doubt that the incident was regarded as miraculous in early Christian times; else why should it have been handed down? For Jesus' raisings from the dead see note before vii. 11.

55. *And her spirit returned.* Luke is careful here again to use words which emphasise her death. Mark has simply 'the damsel rose up and walked.'

he commanded that something be given her to eat. (**56**) *he charged them to tell no man.* The story closes with what seems to be genuine tradition. Jesus' quick thoughtfulness for others suggests to Him that the girl will need food after what she has been through. He may also have wished to prevent her being treated as an 'infant phenomenon,' and to give her mother something to do. [Some critics, on the other hand, suggest that the detail is introduced as conclusive proof of the reality of her restoration to life.] The order to keep the miracle secret has been attacked as 'a thoughtless addition of a conventional detail by Mark,' because it was not likely to be, and almost certainly was not, effective. (Matthew implies this perhaps: Matt. ix. 26.) The same may be said of almost all the occasions where the command for silence is recorded: yet the fact that the expression of Jesus' desire to avoid publicity has been so faithfully preserved in records which are the product of a time when the full significance of that desire was almost certainly not understood, may be held as strong evidence for its historicity.

And he called the twelve together, and gave them power 9
and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And he 2
sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal
the sick. And he said unto them, Take nothing for your 3

Additional Note. The notes on the four 'Wonder-stories' told in this chapter have suggested that their present form may be due to telling and retelling in popular and uncritical circles. An interesting note on them will be found in H. G. Wood's 'St Mark' (in *Peake's Commentary*), of which I quote the conclusion: 'These stories come from men who were neither wise nor noble. They are a tribute to Jesus from lowly minds. Their dramatic power and popular appeal do but emphasise their central interest—the impression they convey of the spirit of Jesus. The memorable acts and utterances of Jesus which make these stories unique are all concerned with the maintenance of simple trust in God—a trust that triumphs over natural dangers, demonic powers, disease and even death.'

IX. 1–6. THE SENDING OUT OF THE TWELVE

Mark vi. 7 f. (cp. Matt. x. 1 f.; Luke x. 1 f.)

Luke here omits Mark's account of Jesus' visit to Nazareth (Mark vi. 1–6) because he has already given a different version of the incident at the beginning of the Galilean ministry (iv. 16–30). For his reasons for so placing the incident see note on iv. 16.

Apparently Mark and Q contained different versions of the instructions given by Jesus to the Twelve. Luke follows Mark in the main, with some differences in detail due to his use of Q also, in the present passage (Mark vi. 7–13); and gives the Q version as addressed to the 'Seventy' in chapter x. Matthew has combined the two (Matt. x).

1. Jesus feels that the time is so short and the ground to be covered so wide that a more rapid proclamation of His message is necessary. The historical situation is a natural one, as also is its sequel. Herod's attention is drawn to Jesus, and, when the Twelve return, a period of retirement begins.

This verse is much more like Matt. x. 1 than Mark vi. 7. See note above.

2. This verse is peculiar to Luke. Cp. x. 9.

3. 'Depend on those to whom you go for hospitality: and travel light so that you can get about quickly and give all your energy to your work.' *neither staff.* So also Matthew, but Mark 'save a staff only.' This is a well-known discrepancy, though of little real importance. It is not easy to decide which version is the more original. On the one hand 'the more peremptory formula perhaps suits better the spirit of Jesus and the circumstances of the first mission' (Loisy): but, on the other hand, 'perhaps tradition has added a more complete privation' (Swete): again, 'the formula of Luke is that of absolute poverty, while that of Mark, with its alternations of things allowed and forbidden, has all the appearance of genuine instructions for a real journey' (Lagrange).

journey, neither staff, nor wallet, nor bread, nor money;
4 neither have two coats. And into whatsoever house ye enter,
5 there abide, and thence depart. And as many as receive you
not, when ye depart from that city, shake off the dust from
6 your feet for a testimony against them. And they departed,
and went throughout the villages, preaching the gospel, and
healing everywhere.
7 Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done: and
he was much perplexed, because that it was said by some,
8 that John was risen from the dead; and by some, that Elijah

wallet. Usually understood as for provisions. Deissmann suggests that Jesus meant by the word a bag such as beggars carried for coins given to them. In that case He would be warning the Twelve against the wandering mendicity so common in Palestine (Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 146).

4. They are not to move about in search of more comfortable quarters.

5. They are not to spend a long time in attempting to overcome hostility or indifference.

shake off the dust from your feet. Lightfoot explains this expression thus: 'The Jews regarded as unclean all earth which was not the earth of Israel, in particular because the Gentiles did not observe the rules of purification with regard to the dead. It was therefore necessary, when re-entering the holy land, to rid oneself of contact with the unclean earth.' Cp. Acts xiii. 51 and xviii. 6.

7–9. HEROD HEARS OF JESUS

Mark vi. 14–16; Matt. xiv. 1–2

7. *Herod.* Note on iii. 1. He ruled Galilee and Peraea. For Luke's information about Herod, cp. viii. 3 note.

Herod's correct title was that of 'tetrarch,' so Matthew and Luke naturally alter Mark's popular designation of him as 'king.'

In Mark and Luke Herod hears of Jesus through the preaching tour of the Apostles. Matthew places the incident much later and the reference is therefore lost.

because that it was said by some. It is interesting to compare the three Gospels here. There are two readings in Mark, 'they said' and 'he said.' Matthew has 'he said.' Luke obviously read 'they said' in Mark. This points to an exceptionally ancient variation of text. There is little doubt that 'they said' is right in Mark. There are three popular rumours about Jesus, which come to Herod's ears. 'They said' would easily be altered to 'he said' in order to follow '(he) heard' more naturally.

John was risen. Perhaps this was the opinion of some of John's faithful followers who hoped still that his death was not the end of his work.

had appeared; and by others, that one of the old prophets was risen again. And Herod said, John I beheaded: but who 9
is this, about whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him.

And the apostles, when they were returned, declared unto 10
him what things they had done. And he took them, and

8. For Elijah as one of the forerunners of Messiah see notes on the Transfiguration later in this chapter. He had not died a natural death, and so was regarded as waiting in Heaven to appear when Messiah was near at hand.

9. *John I beheaded: but who is this, about whom I hear such things?* Mark has 'John, whom I beheaded, he is risen.' If what Mark has is taken as a statement, Luke's version will again differ from Mark's in sense. In that case Mark represents Herod as accepting, in wonder and apprehension, the first of the popular rumours concerning Jesus, while Luke represents him as sceptical and curious. But it is possible to take Mark's version as a question: 'Is it likely that he whom I beheaded is alive again?'—perhaps Luke took it thus—in which case the sense of both versions will be the same. Herod does not accept any of the popular rumours, but waits and sees. Such an attitude seems far more characteristic of a Herod than that of superstitious credulity which is usually attributed to him from Mark's version of this passage—especially if he was a Sadducee.

And he sought to see him. These words are peculiar to Luke. No doubt he introduces them to prepare for Herod's interest in Jesus exhibited in xxiii. 8, when Jesus is sent to him by Pilate—a passage also peculiar to Luke.

10–17. RETURN OF THE TWELVE: FIVE THOUSAND FED

Mark vi. 30–44; Matt. xiv. 13–21; cp. John vi. 1–13

Luke omits here the account in Mark vi. 17–29 of John the Baptist's death. He has already (iii. 20) concluded his account of John's preaching with a statement of his imprisonment by Herod, and he may have felt that any further reference to John was unnecessary, or irrelevant to his purpose as the biographer of Jesus. Or possibly the account of John's death, which is of doubtful historical value, may be an addition to Mark later than the copy of the Gospel which Luke used.

10. Luke considerably abbreviates Mark's introduction to the Feeding of the Five Thousand. In Mark Jesus very naturally suggests to the Twelve, on their return, a period of rest. They go by water across the lake to a 'desert place,' but the crowds come up with them, and Jesus, in pity, begins to teach them.

11 withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida. But the multitudes
perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and spake
to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of
12 healing he healed. And the day began to wear away; and
the twelve came, and said unto him, Send the multitude
away, that they may go into the villages and country round
about, and lodge, and get victuals: for we are here in a desert
13 place. But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they
said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except
14 we should go and buy food for all this people. For they were
about five thousand men. And he said unto his disciples,
15 Make them sit down in companies, about fifty each. And
16 they did so, and made them all sit down. And he took the

to a city called Bethsaida. Mark and Matthew here have simply 'to a desert place.' Mark mentions Bethsaida later (vi. 45) in connection with the Storm and the Walking on the Water, incidents which Luke omits. Luke understands that the feeding of the multitude also took place near Bethsaida and mentions it for clearness' sake at the beginning of that incident. This explains the apparent contradiction of Jesus' action as Luke represents it, in going for solitude 'to a city.' The sequence of events may be taken thus:—Jesus and His disciples are in the neighbourhood of Capernaum where the Twelve have rejoined Him. They decide to seek retirement and cross the north-west corner of the lake to the neighbourhood of Bethsaida. A 'desert place' does not necessarily mean a desert; there was no 'desert' on the shore of the lake. The crowd go by road round the lake—a distance little more than that by water.

Bethsaida Julias is a little over a mile from the north-east corner of the lake. Josephus describes it as a village 'situated on the Lake of Gennesaret, which Philip the tetrarch gave the rank of a city both by the number of its inhabitants and its other splendour, and called it by the name "Julias" after Augustus' daughter' (*Ant.* XVIII. ii, 1). Josephus usually calls it simply Julias.

The parallel in the Fourth Gospel (John vi. 1–13) should be studied here. It suggests that Jesus retired for a short time after getting across the lake, and thus there was time for the crowd to come round the shore.

11. Mark does not mention the healing of the sick here. Matthew and Luke assume that the pity Mark mentions found practical expression in this way.

16. The language of this verse is strikingly similar to that used in the description of the Last Supper (Luke xxii. 19; Mark xiv. 22). On the other hand it must be remembered that it was usual among the Jews to pray with eyes uplifted to heaven (Mark vii. 34; John xi. 41), and that similarly it was the duty of the head of the household to 'bless God and give thanks' before food. See further general note after next verse.

five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude. And they did eat, and were all filled: 17 and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets.

he blessed them. Luke has obscured the meaning by adding 'them' to Mark's 'he blessed,' i.e. God (cp. Mark xiv. 22, 'when he had blessed' (R.V.)). Luke's phrase, 'blessed *them*,' i.e. the loaves, introduces a different and more magical idea.

17. Some commentators seem to regard the *broken pieces* as 'débris,' pieces scattered about by the crowd. It is surely more natural to take the word as intended to mean pieces broken up for distribution by Jesus and not used. The idea is that of Divine liberality, which provides more than enough for all.

Those who decide against the historicity of this story as it stands will explain its origin in different ways. Wellhausen thinks that the story has a basis in fact but that the numbers have been greatly exaggerated, i.e. that Jesus and His disciples shared their provisions with the group of listeners round them. 'The miracle disappears with the figures which, in oral tradition, are regularly liable to perversion.' 'Jesus not only feeds the people with teaching, but also cares for their bodily needs, convinced that the food which has been brought for Himself and His disciples will be enough for the unbidden guests.' Others think that many in the crowd followed the example of Jesus and the Twelve in sharing their food and so all were fed. Others regard the story as developed out of similar stories in the O.T.—the story of Elijah and the widow at Zarephath (1 Kings xvii), or more especially that of Elisha in 2 Kings iv. The striking parallels to this passage to be found in that chapter should be noted, for instance 'What hast thou in the house?' (*v.* 2), 'Give unto the people that they may eat' (*v.* 42), 'So he set it before them, and they did eat, and left thereof' (*v.* 44). Yet the possibility must be kept in mind that the Gospel story is not *suggested* but *coloured* by the O.T. narrative. Loisy regards the story as arising from the Eucharistic experience of the early Church. Here again one must remember that the narrative may well owe several of its phrases—as it undoubtedly does—to the Eucharistic language of later Christian times, without necessarily itself arising from that source.

If Wellhausen's explanation is felt to be 'too easy,' perhaps the most satisfactory solution is that of Strauss and others, who find the origin of the miraculous element in the story in the Messianic expectations of the Jews (cp. John vi. 30–31). This solution may take two forms. It may be held that the story of the feeding of the multitude is entirely fictitious and originated from the expectation that when Messiah came he would join with his followers in a triumphal feast to inaugurate his kingdom. Or, better, that without being miraculous the event did actually take place, and had a Messianic significance to Jesus as the admission of a wider circle of followers to the common meal of Him-

18 And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, Who do the

self and His disciples. In that case either the numbers may have been exaggerated and the miracle thus made necessary; or if the significance of the event was thus symbolical, a small fragment of food only may have been given to each.

18–20. PETER'S ANSWER

Mark viii. 27 f.; Matt. xvi. 13 f.

Luke completely omits here Mark vi. 45–viii. 26. The omitted sections are: the Walking on the Sea, the Dispute with the Pharisees about Ritual Purity, the Syrophoenician Woman, the Deaf Man who Stammered, the Feeding of the Four Thousand, and the Gradual Cure of the Blind Man at Bethsaida. There are three possible explanations of this: 1. That the section was absent from the copy of Mark that Luke used, owing to an accidental mutilation. This idea has been ingeniously developed by Streeter (p. 175 f.). 2. That there were two editions of Mark, the earlier used by Luke, the later by Matthew (who includes this section). This is also fully discussed by Streeter (p. 173 f.). The main objections to it are (1) that in style and language the omitted section of Mark strikingly resembles the rest of the Gospel. This is strongly held by Sir John Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*, p. 122 and *Oxf. Studies*, p. 64 f.): but denied by Stanton (*Gospels as Hist. Doc.* II, p. 168), who assigns a good many of the passages omitted by Luke to the hand of a reviser of Mark; (2) that it is hard to believe that two separate editions of Mark would both have lacked an ending. If the editor of a second edition had revised so thoroughly as to add two chapters in the middle he would surely have completed the ending. 3. It is possible that Luke, who had a considerable amount of peculiar matter to introduce and may have been limited by the scope of a papyrus roll, omitted this section of his own accord. This is the simplest explanation, and it is possible to make out a case for his having preferred, on various grounds, to omit the passages concerned. For instance, the Dispute about Ritual Purity would not have interested his Gentile readers, and the story of the Syrophoenician Woman contained words of Jesus that Luke may have thought distasteful to Gentiles (Mark vii. 27); the Feeding of the Four Thousand is almost certainly a doublet of the Five Thousand, and may either have been added to Mark later by someone who regarded it as a separate event, or may have been omitted by Luke as unnecessary; the Cures of the Deaf and Blind Men each contain elements that Luke may have preferred to avoid—the use of the spittle and the gradual return of sight—as lessening the wonder of the miracles. It is not so easy to understand why he should omit the Walking on the Sea. Streeter suggests that it 'might appear to play into the hands of the Docetae, who asserted that Christ's human body was a phantom, and were already beginning to cause trouble in the Church before the end of the

multitudes say that I am? And they answering said, John 19
the Baptist; but others *say*, Elijah; and others, that one of
the old prophets is risen again. And he said unto them, But 20
who say ye that I am? And Peter answering said, The Christ
of God. But he charged them, and commanded *them* to tell 21

first century' (p. 174). Creed thinks that 'it might be treated as a duplicate of Luke viii. 22–25 (=Mark iv. 35–41)' (The Storm) (Int. p. lxi).

18. Luke differs from Mark here in that he omits the name Caesarea Philippi, and speaks of Jesus at prayer. Perhaps he did not think that the mention of the name was of any interest to readers not concerned with Palestinian geography, or he may have been content with having mentioned Bethsaida in *v.* 10 above, especially as the incident which immediately precedes this passage in Mark (Mark viii. 22–26, omitted by Luke) occurred at Bethsaida. For his mention of Jesus at prayer, cp. iii. 21, ix. 29, xi. 1, etc. He may have felt that this was a critical moment in Jesus' life.

One can sympathise here with Loisy's words 'On n'imagine pas transition plus embarrassée.' 'When He was alone praying, His disciples were with Him' is a contradictory statement, of which an editor can hardly be proud. 'Met Him' is read here instead of 'were with Him' by some MSS; but this may well be an early attempt to improve matters.

19. Cp. ix. 7–8 notes. There has clearly been no general recognition of Jesus as Messiah hitherto. If the enthusiasm described in the Fourth Gospel (John vi. 15) is historical, it obviously died down rapidly when Jesus refused to encourage it. But the synoptic story gives no hint of the impression which so great a miracle as that of the Feeding of the Five Thousand might have been expected to produce.

20. The *ye* is emphatic: 'But *you*—who have lived with Me all these months and known My friendship—who do *you* say that I am?' For Peter as the Apostles' spokesman, cp. viii. 45, xii. 41, xviii. 28. *The Christ of God*: 'The Messiah from God.' Mark simply, 'You are the Messiah.'

21–27. THE WAY OF THE CROSS

Mark viii. 30 f.; Matt. xvi. 20 f.

21. The command for silence may be due to later Christianity's conviction that the failure of the Jews to recognise Jesus as Messiah was in accordance with God's will, so that 'the scriptures might be fulfilled.' [For a discussion of the 'secrecy' noted so frequently by Mark in connection with Jesus' Ministry and Messiahship see Rawlinson, *St Mark*, p. 258 f.] But, if it is original, one can understand Jesus' motive in giving it. He is convinced by this time that His path lies through suffering: probably the 'Suffering Servant' passages in Isa. xlii f. influenced His thought (Isa. xlii. 1–4, xlix. 1–6, l. 4–9, lii. 13–liii). Popular views of Messiah are so widely different from His own—the

22 this to no man; saying, The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and

people expect triumph, He looks forward to death—that any widespread proclamation of His Messiahship would, at this stage, be dangerous. It is a mistake to think that Jewish conceptions of the Messianic kingdom were wholly material: Jesus was not breaking new ground in insisting on a kingdom of righteousness. But His insistent emphasis on the spiritual, and His conception of His own vocation of suffering, were elements which would not find any ready response in popular thought as a whole.

22. This verse, which is presumably a brief summary of teaching given over a considerable period, raises two separate questions. Did Jesus warn the Twelve plainly of His death, and, if so, why were they not better prepared for it when it came? And did He tell them—in fact did He know—of His resurrection?

If Jesus Himself expected death at Jerusalem, there is every reason to suppose that He would have told His disciples of it and tried to prepare them for it. On the other hand it is equally probable that the actual phrases used by the Gospel writers in such a passage as the present one (cp. *v.* 44 below, xviii. 31 f.) have been coloured by after events. The best commentary on the failure of the Twelve to appreciate the full significance of what Jesus told them is supplied by the incident (omitted by Luke: see note below) which in Mark immediately follows this verse. 'And Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him. But He turned and rebuked Peter and said "Get behind Me, Satan: for your thoughts are not God's thoughts but man's."' Jesus rebukes Peter so severely because He feels in his words a recurrence of the temptation He had faced and conquered at the beginning of His work—the temptation to fall in with popular ideas and so get easy terms for the establishment of the Kingdom. To the Twelve, as to Peter, a rejected —and far more, a dying—Messiah must have seemed a contradiction in terms. They had not learnt that 'Love's strength standeth in Love's sacrifice: for he who suffers most hath most to give.' And so one can understand how in spite of Jesus' warnings, when at last the blow fell, their courage failed.

The second difficulty is more serious. That Jesus Himself knew at this time that 'on the third day He would rise again,' or told His disciples so, will seem to many highly doubtful. To many, also, if He did know it, the moral grandeur of His sacrifice will be diminished. A serious operation would lose most of its terrors if the patient could be assured, in full certainty, of a complete recovery and far better health than before. The full humanity of Jesus demands that He should have faced Good Friday without the knowledge that Easter was to follow. Yet this is not to say that Jesus had not complete faith in God—as any other man may have. He did not *know* the future, but He left it with complete obedience and trust in His Father's hands. If He did His duty, God would not let Him down.

To later Christian thought a reference to Jesus' rejection and death may well have seemed not merely incomplete but dangerously mis-

scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up. And 23
he said unto all, If any man would come after me, let him
deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.
For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; but whosoever 24
shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For 25
what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose
or forfeit his own self? For whosoever shall be ashamed of 26
me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed,

leading without mention of its glorious climax. (Cp. Streeter, *Reality*, p. 188.)

The Son of man. Cp. v. 24 note. The title has a special appropriateness here. Messiah though He was, He who was so fully human must suffer and die in humanity's common lot.

Luke omits here Peter's protest and Jesus' severe rebuke (Mark viii. 32–3), no doubt in order to spare the Apostle's memory.

23. Besides the parallel passages here (Matt. xvi. 24 f.; Mark viii. 34 f.), cp. Matt. x. 38–9, Luke xiv. 27 and Luke xvii. 33. The saying about carrying the cross probably stood in Q as well as in Mark; and Matthew and Luke reproduce the Q version in the first two passages named above.

deny himself. A strong word. Almost 'forget that he exists'; 'cease to consider his own interests in the slightest degree.'

take up his cross. This is quite a general phrase, not necessarily affected by after-events. Lagrange (*Marc*, viii. 34 note) shews how commonly the Romans had inflicted crucifixion in Palestine as a punishment for revolt—so that the sight of the condemned carrying his cross to the place of execution would be a familiar one to the Jews of Jesus' day.

daily. Luke adds this to Mark's version, thus emphasising the metaphorical sense of the expression.

24. The difficulty of this saying lies in the double meaning of the Greek word *psychē*. Loisy's explanation is clear: 'Jesus plays on the double sense of the word "spirit" or "life," which represents the principle of natural life and the subject of eternal blessedness. "He who," by denying Jesus, "shall have 'found' his life," having saved it from temporal death, "will lose it" in reality, because he will have lost the true life, the life eternal. "He who shall have lost his life," that is to say, who shall have been put to death for the Gospel's sake, "will find it" truly, because he will have gained thus the happy life of the kingdom of God' (*Ev. syn.* I, 896). In Luke the sense of the passage is more metaphorical than in Mark, and so easier; and refers rather to spiritual self-renunciation, by giving up all desires and interests to follow Jesus.

25. 'If a man does save his life in this world, and wins all the pleasures that the whole world can give, what good is that to him if he has lost the true, eternal, life?'

26. With this verse cp. a similar saying from Q in Luke xii. 9; Matt. x. 33.

when he cometh in his own glory, and *the glory* of the Father,
27 and of the holy angels. But I tell you of a truth, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.

27. *till they see the kingdom of God.* Mark has 'till they see the kingdom of God come with power': Matthew 'till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' The three writers present interesting differences here. Luke omits the words 'come with power,' probably because they seemed to him inappropriate to the idea of the gradual establishment of the Kingdom through the coming of the Spirit in the Church. Matthew, on the other hand, who is a 'thorough-going eschatologist,' heightens the eschatology by introducing into it a reference to the coming of the Son of Man.

28–36. THE TRANSFIGURATION

Mark ix. 2–8; Matt. xvii. 1–8

Luke's version of this event is a good deal fuller than Mark's. He may perhaps have had another source beside Mark (possibly 'Proto-Luke' may have overlapped with Mark), or more probably his additions may be explained as due to his own inferences from, and explanations of, Mark's narrative.

It is possible to regard this story as entirely mythical: as the expression, that is to say, of the Christian Church's beliefs about Jesus read back into His earthly life—a Divine attestation of His mission which was regarded as of high evidential value. The note that follows takes the view that the story has a foundation of genuine historical reminiscence. Yet, even so, the story as we have it is the materialised record of a subjective experience, rather than the narrative of an objective supernatural demonstration. The Transfiguration is the third of four studies in the Personality of Jesus which the Gospels give us; the others are the Baptism, Temptation and Agony. These events in Jesus' life should not be regarded as isolated, either in the sense that they are not closely connected with what precedes and follows them, or that they could not have happened in any degree to anyone else than Jesus. They shew us the emotions and struggles in the human soul of Jesus, and they arise out of what is behind and before Him. As in human life to-day, these experiences in Jesus' life represent the contact of the human with the Divine. So it is with the Transfiguration. Jesus knows that the end cannot be far off. He has warned the disciples that He must die. And now He goes apart to be with God and to find strength for what is in front of Him. 'The Transfiguration is best understood as a mystic experience of self-dedication and Divine assurance which Jesus went through soon after the decisive disclosure to the disciples of what lay in store for Him' (H. G. Wood in *Peake's Commentary*). It is interesting to see how Luke interprets the story on these lines, as a 'record of the inner life of Jesus,' while in Mark and Matthew the experience of the three Apostles is the central fact. Luke's

And it came to pass about eight days after these sayings, 28
he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up
into the mountain to pray. And as he was praying, the 29
fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment
became white *and* dazzling. And behold, there talked with 30

interpretation corresponds with the trend of modern criticism of the passage.

The story falls into two parts—the experience of Jesus Himself, and the vision of the Apostles. Jesus prays to God with all His heart for strength to face death bravely, and as He prays there comes the answer to the prayer—the strength for which He had prayed. His face becomes radiant with ecstasy and hope, and the disciples, waking from sleep, see Him with the radiance on His face, and are astonished.

The minds of the Apostles were full at this time of apocalyptic enthusiasm and Messianic expectation. Moses and Elijah—who, according to the O.T. stories, had not tasted death—were expected to return when Messiah came. Thus there is nothing unlikely in the story of a vision to the three Apostles of Moses and Elijah with Him whom they had but lately acknowledged as Messiah. [Allowance will have to be made for the development of the narrative in detail on objectively supernatural lines. For an interesting discussion see Berguer, *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus from a Psychological Point of View*, p. 230 f.]

28. *about eight days after.* Mark and Matthew 'after six days.' Perhaps Luke's phrase is intended to mean the same as that of Mark by counting the first and last day as well. Or Luke may have preferred to substitute a less definite expression, 'about a week afterwards.' Mark's phrase is the only definite date he gives before the Passion: which suggests the closeness of the connection with what precedes.

John and James. Here, as in viii. 51, Luke puts John before James, no doubt because John was the more prominent in the tradition of the Church of his day.

into the mountain. Much ink and paper have been wasted in defending various identifications of this 'mountain.' The experience may have taken place on the hills: but in any case the 'mountain' is to be sought rather in the 'recesses of the spirit' than on the map of Palestine.

29. Everyday experience witnesses to the effect of emotion upon expression, and the lives of mystics of the past supply evidence of the 'transfiguring' effect of rapt communion with God.

The second half of the verse summarises shortly Mark's picturesque description. Both in the O.T. and the N.T. glistening white garments are the traditional apparel of supernatural visitants. For the Divine brilliance in the O.T. cp. Ps. civ. 2; Hab. iii. 4. Thus the detail is a natural embellishment of the story here.

30. The Jews of N.T. times believed that Elijah still lived and would appear again on earth as the forerunner of the Messiah. This belief is a later stage of that expressed in Malachi iv. 5: 'I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.' The

him two men, which were Moses and Elijah; who appeared
31 in glory, and spake of his decease which he was about to
accomplish at Jerusalem. Now Peter and they that were
32 with him were heavy with sleep: but when they were fully
awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with
33 him. And it came to pass, as they were parting from him,
Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here:
and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for
34 Moses, and one for Elijah: not knowing what he said. And

expectation that Moses would also reappear is, apparently, a later development still of the same belief (cp. *HDCG*, art. 'Elijah').

31. This and the next verse are peculiar to Luke.

Cp. 2 Pet. i. 15, a reminiscence of this passage. Through all the 'glory' the thought of the coming suffering is paramount. Jesus' death and the Divine glory are not opposed, but closely connected. His contact with the Divine brings Him fresh assurance that through death His glory is to be won.

32. *heavy with sleep.* Cp. xxii. 45 at Gethsemane.

If these two verses are based on historical reminiscence, they seem to explain the circumstances of the Apostles' vision in the drowsy state between sleep and wakefulness.

33. *as they were parting from him.* Luke adds these words to Mark's narrative, perhaps in order to explain, and so to excuse, Peter's intervention. Peter wishes to keep the heavenly visitors longer. Both Luke and Matthew omit here Mark's reference to the Apostles' fear (Mark ix. 6), but introduce it later in their accounts.

it is good for us to be here. These words, and the sentence which follows, may be taken either as a statement or a question. The sense will be quite different. If, as is usual, the words are taken as a statement, 'It is a good thing that we are here (so that we can make tents to do honour to Moses and Elijah and keep them longer)'—which is a more exact translation than 'It is good *for* us to be here'—they shew Peter's appreciation of the supernatural company in which he found himself, and his desire to remain in it as long as possible. But it is not altogether in keeping with Peter's nature that he should thus so successfully rise to the occasion, and it is also difficult to reconcile this interpretation with the statement below that 'he did not know what he said.' If the two sentences are taken as questions, the sense will be 'Is it right that we should be here? And are we to make...?' Peter is thus awestruck and bewildered, and suggests that he and the others should make tents to conceal the divine brightness from human sight (cp. note on *v.* 34 below)—and then go. It is no place for them.

It is perhaps necessary to point out that as punctuation is rare in the older Greek MSS such an alteration as that suggested above is entirely legitimate.

while he said these things, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my 35
Son, my chosen: hear ye him. And when the voice came, 36
Jesus was found alone. And they held their peace, and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen.

34. *a cloud.* Cp. Ex. xxiv. 15 f., xl. 34, etc. A traditional accompaniment of the presence of God. See *HDCG*, art. 'Shekinah.'

35. The writer of 2 Peter—a pseudonymous work of the second century—speaks thus: 'For He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with Him in the holy mount' (2 Pet. i. 17, 18).

To Jesus Himself—and possibly to the Apostles also—the 'voice' symbolises the central fact of the experience. To Jesus there comes from God the reassurance and strength that He needs—to the Apostles a steadier confidence in Jesus and a deeper faith in His Messiahship. Compare the note on the Baptism, iii. 22. For the actual words used here compare that passage, and also Ps. ii. 7; Is. xlii. 1 and Deut. xviii. 15.

The story and its sequel are well interpreted for the modern reader in F. L. Hosmer's hymn:

Not always on the mount may we
Rapt in the heavenly vision be:
The shores of thought and feeling know
The spirit's tidal ebb and flow.

Lord, it is good abiding here,
We cry, the heavenly presence near:
The vision vanishes; our eyes
Are lifted into vacant skies.

Yet hath one such exalted hour
Upon the soul redeeming power;
And in its strength through after-days
We travel our appointed ways;

Till all the lowly vale grows bright,
Transfigured in remembered light,
And in untiring souls we bear
The freshness of the upper air.

The mount for vision,—but below
The paths of daily duty go,
And nobler life therein shall own
The pattern on the mountain shewn.

37 And it came to pass, on the next day, when they were
come down from the mountain, a great multitude met him.
38 And behold, a man from the multitude cried, saying, Master,
I beseech thee to look upon my son; for he is mine only child:
39 and behold, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out;
and it teareth him that he foameth, and it hardly departeth
40 from him, bruising him sorely. And I besought thy disciples
41 to cast it out; and they could not. And Jesus answered and
said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be
42 with you, and bear with you? bring hither thy son. And as
he was yet a coming, the devil dashed him down, and tare
him grievously. But Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and
43 healed the boy, and gave him back to his father. And they
were all astonished at the majesty of God.

But while all were marvelling at all the things which he

37–43 *a*. THE EPILEPTIC BOY

Matt. xvii. 14 f.; Mark ix. 14 f.

Luke omits here the question of the disciples about Elijah (Mark ix. 9–13) as uninteresting for his Gentile readers. He very considerably abbreviates Mark's detailed account of this incident.

37. *on the next day.* Luke connects this incident closely with the Transfiguration. 'The transition from the Mount of Transfiguration to the depressing and squalid scene below is one of the most dramatic in the Gospels and has been a favourite subject of Christian Art.... The most famous is Rafael's great picture at the Vatican....He depicts the Transfiguration above and the episode of the Epileptic Boy below' (Lonsdale Ragg, *ad loc.*).

38. *mine only child.* Luke only, viii. 42 note.

39. The symptoms seem to be those of epilepsy, with three stages —a cry and a fall, frenzy, and coma.

41. The words of Jesus in this verse are a striking indication of His loneliness and disappointment—of the feeling of futility, as it were, that was upon Him. He longs to be freed from the hopeless task of teaching the unimaginative and unresponsive. He cannot make them see what faith in God's power will do.

42. Luke and Matthew both omit the question of Jesus to the boy's father with regard to the length of his illness, and the father's reply which includes the striking words 'I believe; help thou mine unbelief.' Perhaps they did not care to represent Jesus as asking for information.

43 *a*. This verse is peculiar to Luke. He omits the disciples' question to Jesus about their own inability to heal the boy, and also Jesus' reply, in order to spare the disciples.

did, he said unto his disciples, Let these words sink into your 44
ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands
of men. But they understood not this saying, and it was 45
concealed from them, that they should not perceive it: and
they were afraid to ask him about this saying.

And there arose a reasoning among them, which of them 46
should be greatest. But when Jesus saw the reasoning of 47
their heart, he took a little child, and set him by his side,

43 *b*–45. SECOND PREDICTION OF THE PASSION

Mark ix. 30 f.; Matt. xvii. 22 f. Cp. Luke ix. 22, xviii. 31

On this occasion Luke's version differs considerably from that of Mark.

43 *b*. This is Luke's own introduction to what follows. Perhaps he has in mind a contrast between the crowd's admiration in *v.* 43*a* and the suffering foretold in *v.* 44 to the disciples.

44. This prediction of the Passion is the least definite of all those given in the Gospels. This may be due to Luke himself. He may have wished to avoid the repetition of similar details and so simply preserved here the central fact. Or possibly this indefinite form of the saying, which makes no reference to the mode of death or to the resurrection, may be the original form preserved in some tradition at Luke's disposal.

45. *it was concealed from them.* This statement, so typical of the early Christian view of Jesus' life as immediately governed by the direction of God in accordance with a pre-arranged plan, may have been introduced here by Luke in order to take the responsibility for their failure to understand off the Apostles. 'It must have been God's will that they should not understand,' he says. For the failure of the Apostles to reconcile suffering with their Messianic views see note on *v.* 22 above. Such a note as the following: 'They were not allowed to understand the saying then in order that they might remember it afterwards, and see that Jesus had met His sufferings with full knowledge and free will,' belongs to an era of interpretation now happily past. There is nothing to be gained by refusing to acknowledge that some characteristics of the Gospel narratives are due to imperfect ideas of God.

46–48. HUMILITY

Mark ix. 33 f.; Matt. xviii. 1 f.

46. In Mark the disciples discuss the question of precedence as they walk along: Jesus asks them the subject of their discussion. Luke, in the next verse, makes Jesus read their thoughts.

47. *he took a little child.* Luke has altered Mark's order in this section, decidedly for the worse. In Mark Jesus answers the dispute among the Twelve by the words 'if any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister of all' (Mark ix. 35 *b*). Luke reproduces

48 and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this little child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same is great.

49 And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him, because he

this, in a slightly different form, later (*v.* 48 *b*), and puts first the reference to the little child, which has no very clear connection with the dispute and may well have been a separate incident (the connection is no clearer in Mark). 'The question of precedence seems to have occupied the minds of the disciples more than once. It reveals the ideas of the Kingdom which made it difficult for them to understand the Cross' (H. G. Wood).

48. With the first half of the verse compare the somewhat different saying at xviii. 17. The exact meaning of the saying—which, as has been said above, does not seem to be in its proper context—is not easy to determine. A 'little child' may be understood literally, in which case the saying will be an exhortation to kindness towards children, as specially dear to Jesus (*in my name*): but although such an injunction would be entirely characteristic of Jesus, it is perhaps more probable that *this little child* should be understood metaphorically as a type of humility. *in my name* can mean either 'on the ground of his connection with Me,' 'because he bears My name,' or simply 'for My sake.' So then the meaning will be either, 'He who is kind to a humble believer because he is My disciple is kind to Me...'; or more generally, 'He who is kind to the humble for My sake is kind to Me....' Cp. Luke x. 16, and Matt. x. 40.

49–50. TOLERATION

Mark ix. 38 f.

49. The connection of this incident with the preceding verses is perhaps that it is wrong to hinder either a humble worker for Christ or a little child. But this is doubtful. The incident itself has been held to be unhistorical on the ground that exorcisms 'in the name' of Jesus would not have been attempted at so early a time. 'It may be inferred that the question had arisen in the community as to what attitude should be adopted towards those who, though not strictly members of the Church, successfully exorcised in the name of Jesus. Answer is given in the form of an incident' (Creed). Loisy recognises Paul in the exorcist, and thinks the story a plea for wider toleration of his work by the other Apostles. But if Jesus performed works of healing as widely as the Gospels suggest, the use of His name in exorcism, even during His own lifetime, is not unnatural. It may also be justly argued that there were few, if any, periods in the Church's early history when the 'free-lance' is likely to have been defended against ecclesiastical authority by the attribution of such words to Jesus.

followeth not with us. But Jesus said unto him, Forbid *him* 50
not: for he that is not against you is for you.

And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come 51
that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to

50. *for he that is not against you is for you.* Luke puts 'you' in both halves of the sentence in place of Mark's 'us' because the incident has strictly concerned the disciples only, not Jesus Himself. There is an apparent contradiction with xi. 23, where Jesus says 'He that is not with me is against me.' Loisy discredits as 'subtleties' any attempt to reconcile the two sayings. 'The truth is,' he says, 'that the two sentences, which were popular proverbs, have been freely used by the Christian tradition when opportunity arose.' This may be true. On the other hand, if the two sayings were spoken in different circumstances, the contradiction may become more apparent than real. Here the reference is to one who is in no sense an avowed follower of Jesus. 'What he is doing is better than nothing,' Jesus says: 'accept it for what it is worth.' In the other passage, if the context is original, Jesus is speaking of the battle He is waging against Satan. In this battle neutrality or half-hearted service is of no use to Him. 'You must be altogether on My side,' He says, 'or not at all.'

IX. 51–XVIII. 14. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

In this section—sometimes known as the 'Great Insertion'—Luke is almost entirely independent of Mark. Part of his material here comes from Q and is found, often in other contexts, in Matthew. But for the rest he is using a source peculiar to himself. The section contains, to use Streeter's phrase, the 'centre and core' of Luke's gospel. See further Streeter, p. 203 f.

51–56. THE SAMARITAN VILLAGE

Peculiar to Luke

Jesus' progress towards Jerusalem is described by Luke with the greatest vagueness as a whole. But here, contrary to Mark and Matthew, he seems to regard Jesus as having taken the direct route south from Galilee through Samaria. In Mark he goes through Peraea, i.e. He crosses the Jordan north of Samaria and goes south on the east side of the river, crossing again lower down. This was the commoner route because of the Samaritan hostility towards the Jews (see note below), which would be intensified in the case of Passover pilgrims going to Jerusalem, and ignoring the Samaritan sanctuary at Gerizim. The Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as passing through Samaria (cp. the Woman at Jacob's Well, John iv), and it is quite possible that Jesus refused to be bound by Jewish prejudice in the matter.

51. The writer's attention is fixed now on the end of Jesus' life and so he can speak, some months earlier apparently, of 'the days of His

go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face: and
they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to
make ready for him. And they did not receive him, because
his face was *as though he were* going to Jerusalem. And when
his disciples James and John saw *this*, they said, Lord, wilt
thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and con-
sume them? But he turned, and rebuked them. And they
went to another village.

Ascension being fulfilled,' i.e. 'the period before it coming to an end.' The second half of the verse has a solemn ring, implying the unswerving courage with which Jesus went to meet His death at Jerusalem.

52. *messengers.* These will simply be some of the Twelve sent ahead to arrange for lodging.

The feud between the Jews and the Samaritans dates from the time of the rebuilding of Jerusalem under Ezra and Nehemiah, when the Samaritans were not allowed to join the Jews in building and consequently did their best to hinder the work (Ezra iv. 3; Neh. ii. 20). Soon a rival temple and priesthood were established on Mt Gerizim and the breach became irreparable. At Jesus' time the feud was extremely bitter. For the history and religion of the Samaritans see *HDCG*, art. 'Samaria.'

54. *fire to come down from heaven, and consume them.* From the LXX of 2 Kings i. 10, 12. In Mark iii. 17 James and John are given the title of '*Boanerges*,' explained by Mark as meaning 'sons of thunder.' But the Hebrew or Aramaic derivation of the word has not been satisfactorily explained, and there may either be a corruption, or Mark's translation may be incorrect. The existence of the title, understood as Mark understood it, may perhaps explain the mention of these two Apostles in particular here. On the other hand, if the title is rightly understood as referring to their 'stormy' character, the present passage may help to explain the application of the nickname to them.

At the end of this verse the words 'even as Elijah did' are added by some MSS. At the end of *v.* 55 some MSS add 'and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.' After *v.* 56 some MSS read 'For the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' The third of these readings seems to be an adaptation of xix. 10: the second is quite in the spirit of Jesus and points the moral of the passage: the first may merely be a gloss, but it also brings out more clearly the contrast between the old dispensation and the new. It is suggested that the readings are of Marcionite origin (for Marcion see an interesting study in Burkitt, *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 289 f.: or a history of the early Church). They certainly emphasise the cardinal point in Marcion's teaching, the contrast between the God of the O.T. and the God of whom Jesus taught.

And as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, 57
I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus said 58
unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven
have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his
head. And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, 59
Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. But he said 60
unto him, Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but go

57–62. WOULD-BE DISCIPLES

The first two of these incidents (*vv.* 57–60), in a somewhat different form, are found in Matthew (viii. 19–22). The third is peculiar to Luke. They 'occur here with great appropriateness at the beginning of the last journey to Jerusalem, when to follow Jesus meant to follow Him to death' (Creed).

58. It does not seem necessary to consider seriously the suggestion that 'wherever you are going' in the last verse means 'wherever you are going *now*' only. A scribe (Matt. viii. 19), who may have known Jesus for some time, enthusiastically declares his intention of throwing in his lot with Him. Jesus does not refuse his offer, but warns him that he will have to 'rough it.' The exact sense of Jesus' words may be somewhat differently understood. If 'the Son of man' is Himself, Jesus may be referring either, literally, to His own homelessness, or to His position as a religious outcast. 'You will have to bear privation if you come with Me: I have no settled home.' If 'the son of man' means here simply 'men,' the contrast will be rather between the care-free lot of the animals and the toilsomeness of human life in general. This does not, however, suit the context well: and some therefore regard the saying as a proverbial one applied to Jesus later by a change of interpretation in the words 'son of man.'

59. *suffer me first to go and bury my father.* In order to soften the apparent harshness of Jesus' answer, this request has been understood as meaning 'Let me stay at home till my father is no longer alive'—'the disciple did not feel justified in leaving home while the head of the house was still alive. In accord with oriental feeling, he was not yet his own master' (Grieve). It seems scarcely possible that the Greek can really mean this. The plain sense of the words is that the man's father was dead, and awaiting burial.

60. No really satisfactory explanation of this saying has yet been proposed. Most commentators explain it by taking *dead* in the first case figuratively, 'Leave the spiritually dead to bury their own dead.' Again this seems to be straining the sense. Some see a corruption resulting from a wrong reading in the Aramaic original—an alternative reading would give the sense, 'Leave the dead to the burier of the dead.' It is best to take the words quite literally, 'Leave the dead to bury their dead.' This seems harsh—'let the dead take care of themselves'—in view of the extreme sacredness with which the duty of burial was invested among the ancient peoples: but it must be remembered here, as with so many short sayings of Jesus, that by His tone

61 thou and publish abroad the kingdom of God. And another also said, I will follow thee, Lord; but first suffer me to bid
62 farewell to them that are at my house. But Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

10 Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others,

or look, or more that He said, He may have made His meaning clear enough. 'Don't worry about the dead,' He may have said quite gently, 'but go and win living men for Me.' Is it not possible also that He may have thought exaggerated and meaningless the elaborate funeral rites of His day? May He not have wished to give men a truer view of death? Those who know what a Christian funeral can still be like among the uneducated in England will be slow to convict Him of unnecessary harshness here.

X. 1–16. THE SENDING OUT OF THE SEVENTY

Luke gives here as addressed to Seventy (or Seventy-two, see below) disciples the Q version of Jesus' missionary instructions (see note at beginning of chapter ix) which Matthew combines with Mark's version and gives as addressed to the Twelve (Matt. x. 5–40). Luke has already given the Mission of the Twelve in ix. 1–6, where he mainly followed Mark.

The historicity of this 'Mission of the Seventy' is doubtful. It is true that much of this section of his gospel is peculiar to Luke, but it seems unduly strange that so important and public an event should have found no mention elsewhere. Moreover, although *v.* 1 speaks of the 'Mission' as preparatory to a visit by Jesus Himself, the instructions seem to contemplate entirely independent work on the part of the 'Seventy'—and in *v.* 17 they all come back to Jesus. If Luke found the material he uses here in Q without any indication of context, he may have combined it with a tradition known to him of a wider proclamation than that of the Twelve recorded by Mark: or he may have himself provided a setting for this version of Jesus' instructions, for which he was anxious to find a place in his gospel. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Luke's universalism, acquired under the influence of Paul, may explain his motive in doing so. The number seventy (or seventy-two in the LXX text) is that of the nations of the world in Gen. x (cp. the seventy members of Jacob's family in Egypt, Gen. xlvi. 27: the seventy elders appointed by Moses, Ex. xxiv. 1; Num. xi. 16): and although he gives no indication here that the Seventy were sent to others than Jews, he may have wished to present it as a symbolic foreshadowing of the preaching to all nations which he himself had seen so wonderfully carried out. Or possibly the tradition of a Mission of Seventy may have arisen earlier than Luke as a variant of the Mission of the Twelve, under the influence of the numerical associations mentioned above.

1. This verse is peculiar to Luke. The following verses, down to *v.* 16, all find parallels in Matthew, mostly in Matt. x.

and sent them two and two before his face into every city
and place, whither he himself was about to come. And he 2
said unto them, The harvest is plenteous, but the labourers
are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he
send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: behold, 3
I send you forth as lambs in the midst of wolves. Carry no 4
purse, no wallet, no shoes: and salute no man on the way.
And into whatsoever house ye shall enter, first say, Peace 5
be to this house. And if a son of peace be there, your peace 6
shall rest upon him: but if not, it shall turn to you again.
And in that same house remain, eating and drinking such 7
things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire.
Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye 8
enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before
you: and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, 9
The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But into what- 10
soever city ye shall enter, and they receive you not, go out
into the streets thereof and say, Even the dust from your 11
city, that cleaveth to our feet, we do wipe off against you:

seventy: an equally strongly attested reading is 'seventy and two.'

2. Matt. ix. 37–38. The context in Matthew is before the Mission of the Twelve—an appropriate position. The words are not appropriate as Luke has placed them, for Jesus would not have told the Seventy themselves to pray for workers to be sent.

3. A shorter form of the saying found in Matt. x. 16. The verse forms in Matthew the first of seven verses (Matt. x. 16–22) which appear to reflect the experience of the persecution of later days, and do not suit the time of the Mission of the Twelve.

4. Cp. Matt. x. 10. Cp. also Mark vi. 8, which Luke has already used in ix. 3 (see notes there).

5–6. Cp. Matt. x. 11–13; Mark vi. 10 (Luke ix. 5). *son of peace* is an Aramaic phrase, cp. 'son of man'—'son of hell' (Matt. xxiii. 15). 'A peaceful man,' 'a soul breathing peace' (Moffatt): one who is worthy to receive the peace from God which the missionaries pray that he may have. If he shews himself unworthy, then the prayer will not be answered—the 'peace' will return to the Apostle to be used for others who are more worthy.

7–8. Matt. x. 10 *b*, 11; Mark vi. 10 (Luke ix. 4, note). Cp. 1 Cor. ix. 7, 14. Also 1 Tim. v. 18: 'For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his hire.' They are not to hesitate to accept the hospitality that would be freely offered them.

9. Matt. x. 7, 8. In Matthew preaching comes before healing.

10–11. Matt. x. 14; Mark vi. 11 (Luke ix. 5, note).

howbeit know this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh.
12 I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable in that day for
13 Sodom, than for that city. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which were done in you, they would have
14 repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. Howbeit it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judge-
15 ment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt be brought down unto Hades.

howbeit know this etc. 'But, although you refuse to believe it, the kingdom will surely come. You have been warned and will not be able to plead ignorance.'

12. Matt. x. 15. *Sodom*, Gen. xix. Together with Gomorrah, which Matthew adds here, the typical example of wickedness and sudden doom in O.T. It would be better for them in the day of judgement than for the Jewish cities of Jesus' day because they had not the warning and the chance of repentance that the Apostolic preaching gave. *in that day*: explained by Matthew, 'in the day of judgment.'

13–15. These verses are parallel to Matt. xi. 21–23. The context in Matthew is different, but very vague. The passage may have stood in Q without any indication of context: or it may have been joined in Q to the verse about Sodom owing to similarity of subject, and separated by Matthew. It seems very doubtful if the words are to be regarded as original. They seem rather to be the product of a later generation. For Jesus had not completely failed to find acceptance in the cities of Galilee. Moreover it is quite unlike Him to make miracles the basis of faith.

13. 'Alas for thee' is a better translation than '*Woe unto thee*': the phrase is not so much a curse as an expression of pity. Cp. Matt. xxiii. 13–15, of the scribes and Pharisees.

Chorazin is identified with some ruins two miles N.E. of Capernaum. It is not otherwise mentioned in the Gospels.

sackcloth. A coarse, dark-coloured cloth, made of the hair of goats or other animals, used for clothing as well as for sacks, and regularly worn by mourners or ascetics. *and ashes.* 'The mourner, or the penitent, would throw dust, or dust mixed with ashes, into the air as an expression of intense humiliation.... Dust and ashes being beneath the feet suggest humiliation, and when thrown into the air they were allowed to fall upon the person of the mourner that he might carry the evidence of his grief with him' (*HDCG*, art. 'Ashes,' 'Sackcloth'). Tyre and Sidon were two typically luxurious heathen cities, often rebuked by the prophets for their wickedness.

15. Isa. xiv. 13, 15. The prophet is speaking of the King of Babylon's pride: and the thought here is of the pride of Capernaum that led to unwillingness to accept Jesus.

He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you 16
rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that
sent me.

And the seventy returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the 17
devils are subject unto us in thy name. And he said unto 18
them, I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven. Behold, 19
I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and
scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing
shall in any wise hurt you. Howbeit in this rejoice not, that 20
the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names
are written in heaven.

16. There is a somewhat similar saying in Matt. x. 40. Cp. also Luke ix. 48 and John xiii. 20.

17–20. THE RETURN OF THE SEVENTY

Peculiar to Luke

17. Cp. Luke ix. 10. *even the devils are subject unto us.* Some commentators see here evidence of a distinction between ordinary cures and the casting out of evil spirits. 'The results exceed the disciples' expectations'—'*Even* the devils obey us.' Apart from the fact that the evidence as a whole is all against any such distinction, Loisy's view of Luke's intention is probably nearer the mark. 'The Evangelist who has imagined the sending out of the Seventy-two and this picture of their return... wishes to indicate that the success of the preaching to Gentiles has surpassed all the hopes of those who had undertaken it, the name of Jesus everywhere repelling the power of the devils' (*Luc*, p. 298).

18. *I beheld.* The verb in the Greek is imperfect and must have been intended by Luke to refer to the time of the Seventy's Mission, not, as some have thought, to some earlier vision on the part of Jesus. For the idea cp. Rev. xii. 9. Satan's ministers are being defeated, their master's downfall is rapid and complete. The authenticity of the saying depends upon that of the passage as a whole.

20. The thought expressed in the verse may well have come from Jesus, with its emphasis on the superior importance of spiritual fitness for the Kingdom to any external manifestation of power.

your names are written in heaven. A frequent O.T. metaphor. Cp. Ex. xxxii. 32; Is. iv. 3; Dan. xii. 1—the register of the citizens of the heavenly city. Cp. also in N.T. Phil. iv. 3, 'my fellowlabourers, whose names are in the book of life,' and Rev. xxi. 27, 'they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.'

21 In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said,
I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou
didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and
didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father; for so it was
22 well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered
unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is,
save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and

21–24. JESUS' THANKSGIVING

Cp. Matt. xi. 25–27; and Matt. xiii. 16, 17

21. In Matthew this saying immediately follows the Woes to the Cities (Luke x. 13–15 above). The emphasis there lies rather on the rejection of the 'wise and prudent' than on the revelation to 'babes.' The passage probably stood so in Q: Luke makes the success of the Seventy's Mission the cause of Jesus' joy, and thus stresses the revelation to the simple.

he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit. This phrase is peculiar to Luke. He sees in Jesus' words the inspiration of the Spirit, cp. i. 41, 67, ii. 27. The verb is a strong one (cp. i. 47): 'thrilled with joy' (Moffatt).

By this time it was clear that the 'wise and prudent'—the learned in the Law—had rejected Jesus, while the 'babes'—those unlearned in the Law, humble simple people without the prejudices that learning might bring—'hear Him gladly.' Jesus is not thankful that the wise do not see, but that *although* the wise are blind, the simple see.

22. This saying, which is practically the same as Matt. xi. 27, has been the centre of much controversy. It is quoted by some of the Fathers somewhat differently, transposing the clauses about the Son's knowledge of the Father and the Father's of the Son ('no one knoweth the Father save the Son, nor the Son save the Father and he to whom the Son revealeth him'). This has led Harnack and Wellhausen to contend that there has been some addition to the saying, which in its original form may have read 'no one knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son revealeth him.' This they defend as historical. Jesus has a special knowledge of God which it is His mission to reveal to men. The use of 'the Son' is Messianic. (Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 272 f.; Lagrange (*contra*), *Luc*, p. 304.) But this view has a somewhat precarious foundation, and to most readers the words will appear strongly reminiscent of the thought and language of the Fourth Gospel: though it is an exaggeration to say, as Plummer does, that 'it contains the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel.' In its use of 'the Father' and 'the Son' as absolute titles it should be compared with such passages as John iii. 35, v. 19, etc.; and the thought is that of some of the most familiar Johannine sayings—'I and my Father are One,' 'As the Father knoweth Me, even so know I the Father,' 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' The question of the historicity of the saying—and any full discussion of its meaning—will depend therefore upon the view held of the relation to history of the

he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*. And turning 23
to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed *are* the eyes which
see the things that ye see: for I say unto you, that many 24
prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see,
and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and
heard them not.

And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, 25

Fourth Gospel itself and its presentation of Jesus—a subject beyond the sphere of a commentary on St Luke. (A particularly helpful essay —on the conservative side—will be found in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 289 f.: 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel,' by Dr A. E. Brooke.) Of modern estimates of the passage the following are typical: the saying 'is the work of a Christian prophet, speaking in the name of Jesus.... The core of the saying is the abstract declaration upon the mutual knowledge of the Father and of the Son, analogous to the speculations of John' (Loisy). We may 'hear in these words as they stand echoes of the thought of the early Church about its Lord and His relations with the Father, rather than echoes of actual words of Jesus' (Creed). Conservative critics find in the verse strong evidence for a high estimate of the Fourth Gospel's historical value. Such a view loses weight with the rapidly increasing realisation that all that is found in the Synoptic Gospels, or even, as with the present passage, in Q, is not necessarily primitive.

23. Matthew gives these verses in a later context (Matt. xiii. 16, 17), that is less appropriate. Here the words carry on the thought of 'didst reveal them unto babes' in *v.* 21.

the things that ye see, i.e. Messiah's coming.

25–28. THE LAWYER'S QUESTION

Cp. Mark xii. 28–34; Matt. xxii. 34–40

Mark gives a similar question and answer in his account of the last week of Jesus' life. This Luke omits when he comes to it in Mark's narrative. Matthew gives the incident where Mark gives it, but in several important details, such as the scribe's motive, agrees with Luke against Mark. This set of circumstances is best explained if an account of the incident stood in Q as well as in Mark. Thus Luke gives it from Q and omits Mark's version: Matthew combines the two accounts (according to his custom), but preserves Mark's order.

25. *stood up* suggests that the scene may have been a synagogue.

tempted him: so Matthew also. In Mark's account the scribe asks his question sincerely, 'knowing that he answered well,' and wins Jesus' approval and praise. Mark is more likely than Q to be right here: for Christian tradition would be much more inclined to blacken rather than to whitewash the memory of a Jewish scribe.

26 saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And
he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest
27 thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy
God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all
thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as
28 thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right:

what shall I do to inherit eternal life? Mark has 'what commandment is the first of all?' Matthew is very similar. Luke has introduced here the question asked by the rich young man (xviii. 18), and answered by Jesus with a quotation of the Moral Law. The two questions are to some extent equivalent. Presumably Luke felt that his readers were not interested in the Law as such; and that the form of the question which he gives was more suitable in that it expressed better the permanent meaning of Jesus' teaching here. There was no short cut to eternal life. The only road was obedience to the Law of Love which was, or should have been, the centre of Judaism and Christianity alike. He recurs to the idea of eternal life in *v.* 28, 'this do, and thou shalt live.'

eternal life. Full discussions of this phrase, which Luke uses again in xviii. 18, 30, will be found in commentaries on the Fourth Gospel, in which it occurs very frequently: see also McNeile, *Mt.* pp. 262–3. It is used in the O.T. for the blessed future life of the righteous (Dan. xii. 2): this is the earliest passage where it occurs, for the O.T. as a whole has no very clear or definite teaching about the future life. But it is common in apocalyptic literature. Thus it might naturally be used to denote that citizenship of the Kingdom of God of which Jesus taught. The phrase comes to mean that in a man which is independent of death: those spiritual values, the attainment of which here and now may link a man to God independently of the limitations of time.

27. *Thou shalt love...with all thy mind* is the beginning of the confession of faith recited twice a day by the Jews and written on their phylacteries. It is derived from Deut. vi. 5. The words *thy neighbour as thyself* come from Lev. xix. 18. It was quite natural, therefore, that the scribe should answer with the first quotation: but it is striking that he should add to it the phrase from Leviticus. Yet the combination of these two passages, as a summary of the whole Law, is already found in the pre-Christian apocalyptic document called 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.' In Mark and Matthew the quotation is made by Jesus Himself, in answer to the scribe's question (Mark xii. 30, 31; Matt. xxii. 37, 39). It has been supposed, therefore, that Luke has transferred the quotation from Jesus to the scribe, in order to lead up to the question on which depends the parable that is to follow. It is perhaps more likely that Christian tradition in Mark and Matthew has been anxious to ascribe to Jesus the authorship of the saying.

this do, and thou shalt live. But he, desiring to justify 29
himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour? Jesus 30
made answer and said, A certain man was going down from
Jerusalem to Jericho; and he fell among robbers, which both
stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half
dead. And by chance a certain priest was going down that 31

29–37. THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN

Peculiar to Luke

29. The difficulty and variation with which commentators explain the exact sense of *desiring to justify himself* in this verse lends support to the view that the verse itself is simply a peg introduced by Luke in order to hang the parable upon it. Some think that the scribe 'wishes to justify his past conduct: he has always observed the law of loving one's neighbour: what neighbour has he failed to love?' Others 'that he wished to shew that his first question was not superfluous: there is still a difficulty for Jesus to explain.' Others that he was 'sincerely anxious to make up for his past neglect.' If Luke introduced the verse himself, the fact that he has represented the action of the scribe in an unfavourable light makes it slightly more probable that he intended the words in the second of the senses given above.

30. This parable, peculiar to Luke, has caught the imagination of all the ages as more characteristic of the mind of Jesus than any other parable except perhaps that of the Prodigal Son, or the short sketch of the Shepherd and the Lost Sheep. Its genuineness has been attacked on the ground that it does not answer the question 'Who is my neighbour?' but 'Whose neighbour am I?' This is quite true, but only a critic who, like Loisy, will never allow an evangelist to tell the truth, could on that ground reject a story such as this. It is possible, if *v.* 29 is an editorial introduction, that Luke has employed the parable in an artificial connection and to illustrate a point somewhat different from that which it was originally intended to illustrate. Yet it may be justly argued that not only does the parable, as it stands now, present a strikingly effective answer to the question of the scribe, but that the method of its answer is entirely characteristic of Jesus. For to ask 'Who is my neighbour?' is not a worthy way to approach the duty of love to one's fellow-men, as if a man were to draw up a list of those who might be supposed to have some claim upon his kindness and be best pleased if he found the list a short one. There is to be no limit, Jesus says, to Love's field of action: who needs me is my neighbour. The same method of reply, by emphasising the fundamental principle upon which all particular cases depend, can be seen in Jesus' answers to the questions put to Him about divorce, the tribute, and the after-life.

was going down. The road goes down 'from Jerusalem, 700 metres above sea level, to Jericho which is 350 metres below the level of the sea. The road crosses the desert immediately after the Mount of Olives and has always been considered as infested by robbers' (Lagrange).

way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side.
32 And in like manner a Levite also, when he came to the place,
33 and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when
34 he saw him, he was moved with compassion, and came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on *them* oil and wine; and he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn,
35 and took care of him. And on the morrow he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come
36 back again, will repay thee. Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers?
37 And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. And Jesus said unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.
38 Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain

33. For the hatred between Jews and Samaritans see ix. 52 note. The existence of the feud between the two peoples enormously increases the point of the parable. It is not only ready kindness that is shewn as opposed to cruel indifference, but kindness from a 'despised schismatic,' overcoming racial ill-feeling though it could expect no similar kindness in return.

A note by Grieve (*Peake's Commentary, ad loc.*) is perhaps of interest: 'Halévy thinks that in the original story the three men were priest, Levite, and Israelite, a frequent and familiar collocation. A Samaritan was not likely, at this period, to be passing and repassing between Jericho and Jerusalem, or to be friendly with the innkeeper. There would certainly be point in a simple layman doing what the clergy had failed to do. Perhaps for his Gentile readers, to whom priest and Levite were Israelites, Luke has corrected (and exaggerated) the third term. But, as Montefiore says, "the Samaritan is in the parable now, and the world will not let him go."' It must be remembered, however, that the details of the parable need not necessarily all be in accord with real life—and the scene of the parable is perhaps due to the fact that Jesus may Himself have been on the road between Jericho and Jerusalem when He spoke it. Moreover such an experience as that narrated in ix. 51 f., if historical, may have emphasised the Samaritan feud to His own and the disciples' minds.

34. The wine would cleanse, and the oil heal. There appears to be evidence for their medical use in this way.

38–42. MARY AND MARTHA

Peculiar to Luke

38. *a certain village.* The Fourth Gospel says that sisters named Mary and Martha lived at Bethany (John xi. 1) near Jerusalem. If Jesus was on the road between Jericho and Jerusalem in the last

village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also 39
sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word. But Martha was 40
cumbered about much serving; and she came up to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. But the 41
Lord answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things: but one thing is 42
needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her.

section, this incident may rightly follow it. But we need not look for any exact geographical or chronological sequence in this section of Luke's gospel.

40. *was cumbered.* The verb means 'allowed her attention to wander,' which strictly implies that Martha had tried to listen but found she could not listen and think about the preparations for the meal at the same time.

41–42. There is considerable variation of reading in these verses. Some MSS omit 'thou art anxious...needful,' and 'for' before 'Mary.' Of the other MSS which include 'thou art anxious...needful,' and 'for,' some give the reading in the text 'but one thing is needful,' others read 'but few things, or one, are needful.' This latter is strongly supported.

Many readers of the English version will have felt surprised at the apparent harshness of Jesus' rebuke, and will have sympathised with Martha in her desire to honour her guest. But, if 'many things,' 'one thing,' 'few things' and 'part' (the Greek word can mean 'portion' or 'helping') are understood as referring to the meal itself, the saying takes on a whimsical humour which may well have been spoken with a smile. The sense will then be 'Martha, Martha, you are worrying and fussing about an elaborate meal—you ought to know Me well enough by this time to be sure that only a few dishes or even one would be enough for Me: Mary has realised that and chosen the best dish of all,' i.e. 'in selecting the nourishment of His teaching' (Moffatt).

Moffatt accepts the shorter reading and translates 'The Lord answered her "Martha, Martha, Mary has chosen the best dish and she is not to be dragged away from it."' But it is more likely that the textual variants are the result of attempts to simplify by omission the original longer reading, than that the longer readings were produced by attempts to explain the short reading.

If the words are taken in the sense suggested above, there will be no reason to question their kindness. Jesus has much to say to His friends and the time is short. He does not wish material needs put first. Yet we need not quarrel with the way in which Christian thought has always found in the passage a warning against neglect of spiritual things, and even a justification of the contemplative life. To Jesus

11 And it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place,
that when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord,
2 teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples. And

Himself the only true foundation for life was spiritual contact with God, and the warning is more than ever necessary in the stress and bustle of modern life.

XI. 1–4. THE LORD'S PRAYER

Matt. vi. 9–13

Luke collects here three short passages on the subject of prayer, the first and third of which appear also in Matthew, the second (the Importunate Friend) peculiar to himself. (But see note on *vv.* 9–13.) There is a very considerable divergence between Matthew's and Luke's versions of the Lord's Prayer, and it is doubtful whether the passage should be assigned to Q. Stanton, for example, so assigns it; and explains the divergences as due to 'the influence of the liturgical usage to which the evangelist' (i.e. Matthew) 'had become accustomed.' 'It would not be strange,' he goes on, 'that he should give the prayer in the form in which he himself knew it best, even though in the document which lay before him it appeared in that briefer form in which we have it in Luke' (*Gosp. as Hist. Doc.* II, p. 90). Streeter, on the other hand, thinks it impossible that the two versions were both derived from the same written source, especially if the reading of Marcion's text is accepted in *v.* 2 of Luke's version: 'Thy spirit come upon us and cleanse us' instead of 'Thy kingdom come.' Easton suggests that Luke and Matthew have both given the versions of the Prayer current in their own circles. If that is so, it is not possible to decide whether Q contained a version of the Prayer, though on general grounds it seems likely that it did. Possibly Luke's version, as the shorter, may be taken as the more original and less affected by liturgical addition.

1. This 'introduction' to the Prayer is peculiar to Luke. Matthew gives the Prayer without introduction in the Sermon on the Mount. If Luke's setting is historical, the Prayer must have been given to the disciples late in the Ministry: but it is quite in Luke's manner to supply a setting for sayings himself.

even as John. Cp. v. 33, 'the disciples of John fast often and make prayers.' Jewish Rabbis used to give their disciples set prayers to use.

2. A comparison of A.V. with R.V. here will shew how the shorter text of Luke was assimilated to the longer version in Matthew. The Lord's Prayer is Jewish both in thought and language. For fuller illustration of this see Montefiore, II, p. 99 f., or McNeile, p. 77. Jesus took what was best in the prayers of His people and moulded it to His own thought. 'Prayer to God as Father, though scarcely dominant as in the Christian Church, was in common use in the Jewish synagogue' (Creed).

he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed be
thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily 3
bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive 4
every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into
temptation.

And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, 5
and shall go unto him at midnight, and say to him, Friend,

Hallowed be thy name. This clause may be taken either as an interjection of praise, or as a petition that men may more widely come to reverence God. In that case it leads on closely to the next clause. Where God is reverenced, His Kingdom comes.

In Hebrew thought the 'name' of someone implies much more than a mere label. It stands for his personality and character. God's 'Name' is thus His Character, Nature, Being. This use is frequent in N.T., both of God and Jesus. Thus 'Holy is His Name' (Luke i. 49), 'Father, glorify Thy Name' (John xii. 28), 'Where two or three are gathered together in My Name' (Matt. xviii. 20), 'The Name of the Lord Jesus was magnified' (Acts xix. 17). (Cp. *HDCG*, art. 'Name.')

Thy kingdom come. 'Thy Reign begin' (Moffatt). Instead of this clause, 'May thy spirit come upon us and cleanse us' is read by some MSS, and was in Marcion's text. Streeter argues (p. 277) that it is the original reading in Luke, afterwards assimilated to Matthew's text. But it may have originated with Marcion (Lagrange), and is in any case less original than Matthew's version. Matthew inserts here 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.'

4. *our sins.* Matt. 'debts,' which appears to be original in view of Luke's 'indebted' below. 'The thought of sins as *debts* was thoroughly Jewish (cp. Matt. xxiii. 16; Luke xiii. 4)' (McNeile, on Matt. vi. 12).

There is a close connection between the two clauses of this petition, which is often lost in modern use of the prayer when a pause is made between them. It is only upon the willingness to forgive others that a man can base his claim for God's forgiveness. The best commentary on this is the parable in Matt. xviii. 21–end, 'The Unforgiving Debtor.'

And bring us not into temptation. Matthew adds here 'but deliver us from the evil one,' which appears to be a liturgical addition designed to attribute the origin of evil to Satan.

The Greek original is perhaps better represented in English by 'trial' than 'temptation': this rendering at least avoids the thought that temptation in the ordinary sense comes from God—a thought which gave difficulty to the early Fathers, and caused various alterations in the Latin versions such as '*ne patiaris nos induci.*' The petition expresses the natural shrinking of man's weakness from moral conflict, and finds its parallel in Jesus' own prayer at Gethsemane, 'Father, if thou be willing, take this cup from Me' (xxii. 42), when, just before, He had bidden His disciples 'Pray that ye enter not into temptation.' 'Thy Will, not Mine' must be the unspoken thought as it is prayed.

6 lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine is come to me from
7 a journey, and I have nothing to set before him; and he from
within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is
now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise
8 and give thee? I say unto you, Though he will not rise and
give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his im-
portunity he will arise and give him as many as he needeth.
9 And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek,
and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.
10 For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh

5–8. THE PERSISTENT FRIEND

Peculiar to Luke: see note at beginning of next section (cp. xviii. 1 f.).

6. The parable speaks, out of Jesus' own experience, of peasant homes where stores would be small and living got from day to day. The most natural explanation of 'My children are with me in the bed' is the literal one. (Some have thought that 'with me' means no more than 'the same as I.') Cp. T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History*, p. 27 f.

8. *importunity*: lit. 'shamelessness.' It is important to remember that we are dealing here with a parable, not an allegory. Just as in a portrait the artist may introduce subordinate objects in considerable detail—vases, a picture, a chair—in order to throw the central figure into greater prominence, so in a parable many of the details are merely parts of the setting, as it were, of the main point. To press the details of the comparison in the present parable would lead to the position that, on the one hand, importunity is a virtue, and, on the other, that God is such that importunity alone can wring from Him answer to prayer. But the details of the comparison are not meant to be emphasised. The action of the characters in the story is intended to illustrate, in broad outline, an aspect of the relation between man and God. The key to the illustration is given in the verses that follow: if men, imperfect and selfish as they are, are yet moved by importunity, how much more will God, who longs, as the all-loving Father, to help His children, hear and answer the prayers of those who in earnestness and patience pray to Him?

9–13. PERSEVERANCE IN PRAYER

Matt. vii. 7–11

This section corresponds very closely to Matthew, and is obviously taken from Q. In view of the closeness of its connection with the parable of the Persistent Friend, it seems very likely that that parable also stood in Q, and was omitted by Matthew possibly as open to misunderstanding, or more probably because he transferred *vv.* 9–13 to the Sermon on the Mount, and did not wish to insert a parable there. As suggested in the note on *v.* 8 above, these verses explain the parable.

9–10. The necessity of prayer. 'You cannot get without asking or

findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. And 11
of which of you that is a father shall his son ask a loaf, and
he give him a stone? or a fish, and he for a fish give him a
serpent? Or *if* he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion? 12
If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your 13
children, how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give
the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

And he was casting out a devil *which was* dumb. And it 14
came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb man
spake; and the multitudes marvelled. But some of them 15

find without looking: and doors do not open of their own accord.' These verses say nothing of the *nature* of the prayer—Jesus has already shewn, in the Lord's Prayer, the kind of things men ought to pray for—and therefore afford no justification for a mechanical view of prayer's efficacy. They simply express the belief, which was the foundation-stone of Jesus' own life, that God is ever ready to hear, and inexhaustible in giving, if men will only put themselves in touch with Him.

11. Some MSS omit the clause about the loaf and stone. If it should be retained, Luke has three pairs to Matthew's two. If, as is probable, it should be omitted as an assimilation to Matthew, Luke has two pairs, but not the same as Matthew. Thus fish—serpent, egg—scorpion (Luke); bread—stone, fish—serpent (Matthew). Perhaps all three were in the original, or only one.

12. The scorpion is 'an insect with lobster-like claws and jointed tail that can be bent over to inflict a poisoned sting on a prey held in its claws.' It is very common in the East. It seems idle to seek for a resemblance between a scorpion and an egg(!)—or between a fish and a snake in *v.* 11. There is no question of *confusion* between the different objects. The point is that no earthly father will *deliberately* give his child something bad when it asks for something good.

13. *being evil.* There is no idea whatever of 'original sin.' The sense is 'You, who do not always do what is right, will do all you can for your children. How much more will God?'

the Holy Spirit. Matt. 'good things.' Matthew's is original, Luke's an interpretation—the Spirit is the source of all good.

14–26. THE CASTING OUT OF DEVILS

Luke takes this section from Q. There is a parallel in Mark iii. 22 f. which Luke does not appear to have used. Matthew combines Mark and Q (Matt. xii. 22 f.).

15. *But some of them.* Matt. 'the Pharisees'; Mark 'the scribes which came down from Jerusalem.' Mark's description of the accusers is convincing in its precision, and the context in which he places the discussion is historically convincing also. Luke appears to be more interested in the charge than in those who voiced it: so, too, would his Gentile readers have been.

said, By Beelzebub the prince of the devils casteth he out
16 devils. And others, tempting *him*, sought of him a sign from
17 heaven. But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them,
Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desola-
18 tion; and a house *divided* against a house falleth. And if
Satan also is divided against himself, how shall his kingdom
stand? because ye say that I cast out devils by Beelzebub.
19 And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons

To the modern mind the charge, if sincerely brought, that Jesus cast out demons by Satan's power, seems ludicrous. Two facts explain how it may have been sincerely made: the vividness of the Jews' belief in personal evil spirits, and their devotion to the Law. Jesus obviously had great power over demons. This power must come from God or Satan. No agent of God could so fail, as Jesus failed, to shew deep respect for each detail of God's sacred Law.

Beelzebub. This is an interesting but difficult word. It is usually regarded as the name of a demon either synonymous with or subordinate to Satan, and explained either as 'lord of flies' (cp. Baalzebub in 2 Kings i), or 'lord of dung.' McNeile, however, suggests that it may have been merely a vulgar term of abuse with no reference to a demon—'lord (master, owner) of dung.' This suits its use in Matt. x. 25, 'If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household.' Under the influence of the name in 2 Kings, this may have been understood by the evangelists as referring to a demon. Or perhaps the phrase 'he hath Beelzebub' in Mark's version of the present passage may have been thus corrupted from an insulting expression connected with the Hebrew word for dung (McNeile, pp. 143, 174).

16. Cp. Matt. xii. 38. Luke introduces this verse to connect the Demon Controversy section with that on the Sign of Jonah which he gives below (*v.* 29 f.). Matthew places a similar introductory verse at the beginning of the latter section. For *a sign*, see note on *v.* 29 below.

17–18. Jesus gives the common-sense answer that it is ludicrous to imagine that Satan would spend his time in undoing his own work.

and a house divided against a house falleth. This is similar in sense to the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark (Matt. xii. 25; Mark iii. 25). But the Greek is more naturally taken as an amplification of the preceding clause '. . . is made desolate, and house falls on house' (or 'house after house falls').

19. This verse is variously interpreted (1) 'The exorcists among you can testify that you never accused *them* of working by Beezebul' or (2) 'You do not accuse your own Jewish exorcists of working by Beezebul—then they themselves will condemn you for your condemnation of me: (*v.* 20) No, I work by the power of God (as they do too)—and if so God's Reign is near.'

your sons: 'your fellow Jews.' The Jews practised exorcism by means of herbs and incantations: cp. Tobit viii. 16; Acts xix. 13;

cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. But if 20
I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of
God come upon you. When the strong *man* fully armed 21
guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace: but when 22
a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him,
he taketh from him his whole armour wherein he trusted,
and divideth his spoils. He that is not with me is against 23
me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. The 24

Josephus, *Ant.* VIII. 2. 5. It has been suggested that *v.* 19 is a later addition reflecting the controversies between Jews and Christians. Its omission would remove the difficulty that as the passage now stands it would logically imply that the coming of the Kingdom might be seen in the success of the Jewish exorcists as much as in Jesus' cures.

20. *by the finger of God.* Ex. viii. 19. Matthew here has 'in the spirit of God.' Probably Luke is original. The sense is 'If my power is God's, and Satan's power is so obviously being conquered, then God's Reign is close upon you.'

21–22. Matthew has followed Mark closely here (Matt. xii. 29; Mark iii. 27). Luke gives the Q version, which is considerably different.

the strong man is, of course, Satan: and the thought 'If Satan's work is being undone, it is clear that Satan himself has been conquered.'

23. In the desperate battle against Satan neutrality is impossible: indifference means hostility. For the apparent contradiction with ix. 50 see note on that verse ('for he that is not against you is for you'). Lagrange has an interesting note (*Marc*, p. 233): 'In these absolute propositions all depends on the way in which one begins. Neutrality is not contemplated. If then someone is not for me, it is the case that he is against me. But if someone is not against me, it is the case that he is for me. The ancients, more accustomed to logic, recognised that the two propositions, contradictory as they appear, both together shew that one must decide for or against Jesus.'

The fact that Matthew also has the verse at this point shews that it stood here in Q. But its original connection is not therefore certain.

gathereth . . . scattereth. Commentators refer the metaphor to corn, or sheep, or a band of followers.

24–26. (Matt. xii. 43 f.) This vivid little parable is complete in itself, and its original context is uncertain. Matthew puts it rather later in the same discourse, which is probably its original position in Q. The illustration may well have been suggested by the relapse of some temporarily cured demoniac, perhaps one whom Jesus Himself had cured. The first attack of madness after a period of sanity is said to be especially severe. The man lacks any interest to occupy his mind—the house is clean and in order, but empty.

It is not possible to determine the original application of the parable. It is a warning, either to cured demoniacs against the danger of idleness and introspection; or more widely to the spiritually healed against the danger of carelessness and apathy in the face of temptation. Jesus'

unclean spirit when he is gone out of the man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will turn back unto my house whence I came out.
25 And when he is come, he findeth it swept and garnished.
26 Then goeth he, and taketh *to him* seven other spirits more evil than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first.
27 And it came to pass, as he said these things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the
28 breasts which thou didst suck. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.
29 And when the multitudes were gathering together unto him, he began to say, This generation is an evil generation:

own experience of the fickle enthusiasm and short-lived repentance of the crowds would supply occasions in plenty for such a warning.

24. *waterless places*—impossible to stay in for long.

26. *seven.* Seven or eight stand for a large number: cp. Micah v. 5.

27–28. TRUE HAPPINESS

These two verses are peculiar to Luke, and contain marks of his own style. The thought is much the same as that in Mark iii. 31–35 (Jesus and His family), which has already been given in Luke viii. 19–21.

27. *these things.* This refers apparently to the parable, but the connection does not seem to lie in Jesus' words. The woman's sympathy is touched, perhaps by His bearing or His spirited defence, and she bursts out into an exclamation of admiration, 'Happy the mother who has such a son as you.'

28. The word translated *Yea rather* is used in classical Greek both in affirmation of what precedes, and also to concede more than is asked so as to form a correction. Thus if a corrective it is a gentle one. Jesus does not spurn the sympathy but deprecates the sentimentality in the woman's words. The truest happiness lies in the spiritual sphere, and is to be won not by words but deeds.

29–32. THE SIGN OF JONAH

Matt. xii. 38–42

From Q. There is a shorter version of the incident in Mark viii. 11–12 which Matthew uses also in xvi. 1 f.

29. Matthew has 'Then answered Him some of the scribes and Pharisees saying "Master, we wish to see a sign from you."' Luke has already given this request in *v.* 16 above. Luke also, as so often,

it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it
but the sign of Jonah. For even as Jonah became a sign 30
unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this

emphasises the presence of 'multitudes' around Jesus. Cp. *v.* 27 above, and xii. 1.

The *sign* that the Jews wanted was something more than works of healing such as Jesus performed every day. Such miracles were not regarded as the Messiah's expected works, and moreover they were recorded of the great O.T. prophets (cp. vii. 22 note). They wanted a display of 'aerial pyrotechnic': a 'sign in heaven' was the recognised heralding of the coming of the Kingdom. Such a sign Jesus would not have given them, had it been His to give (iv. 43 note).

29–30. *the sign of Jonah.* Instead of Luke's *v.* 30, Matthew has 'For as Jonah was in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights, so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights' (Matt. xii. 40).

Jesus could not possibly have said what Matthew records. (1) He did not perhaps know of His Resurrection (ix. 22 note), much less foretell it in detail to the people. (2) To describe as a 'sign' to the people an event which was to occur *after* their rejection of Him would be absurd as well as cynical. (3) Jonah's stay in the whale was not a sign to the Ninevites, who did not apparently know of it at all: nor was Jesus, according to our tradition, 'in the heart of the earth' three days and nights, but two. (4) The point of Jesus' answer must lie in the fact that no supernatural sign would be given.

Luke's version may be variously interpreted (see below), but is not in itself at all objectionable. It does not seem possible to decide what originally stood in Q. Easton thinks that Matthew represents Q, on the ground that elsewhere Matthew always writes 'on the third day' and therefore would not speak here of a three days' interval. In that case Luke has omitted some phrases, why is not very clear. He is not likely to have felt any of the objections mentioned above, except possibly the last. If Luke represents Q, Matthew's version is an attempt to explain a somewhat vague phrase. This appears more probable. Nine people out of ten think to-day that the whale is the main point of the book of Jonah, whereas, in fact, the point of the book is not the whale but God's mercy to the Ninevites. The whale was merely God's method of bringing the reluctant Jonah to Nineveh. Matthew's explanation appears to rest upon this kind of misunderstanding.

But the question still remains—What did Luke understand by the 'sign of Jonah' and, more important, what did Jesus Himself mean by the words which Luke records?

1. That Jesus Himself should have here referred to His Resurrection is, as we have seen, impossible: but Luke may have understood the words thus, without attempting to make the reference explicit, as Matthew has.

2. McNeile, J. Weiss, Loisy explain the thought as that of Messiah's second coming. 'The Son of Man will come, as it were from a foreign

31 generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judge-
ment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn
them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the
wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is
32 here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement
with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented
at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah
is here.
33 No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a
cellar, neither under the bushel, but on the stand, that they
34 which enter in may see the light. The lamp of thy body is
thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is
full of light; but when it is evil, thy body also is full of dark-
35 ness. Look therefore whether the light that is in thee be not

land, with a message of doom to this generation, as Jonah did to the Ninevites' (Jonah iii. 4). This is open to the same charge of cynicism as Matthew's interpretation ((2) above). They ask for a sign by which to believe, and all they will get is a message that they are condemned for their unbelief.

3. The best explanation seems to be that the 'sign of Jonah' is his *preaching* to the Ninevites, to which Jesus compares His own *teaching*. 'I give you no more of a sign than Jonah gave the Ninevites—My teaching is enough.' This not only suits very well the verses which immediately follow—'to hear the wisdom of Solomon' (*v.* 31), 'they repented at the preaching of Jonah' (*v.* 32): but is also completely in accord with Jesus' own view of the primary importance of His teaching work.

31. *The queen of the south*, i.e. the queen of Sheba, 1 Kings x.

shall rise up in the judgement: better, 'shall rise up in judgement with,' i.e. 'shall accuse.'

33–36. LAMPS

33. Luke has already given the Marcan form of this saying in viii. 16. It probably therefore stood here in Q, or Luke would not have repeated it (Easton). Matthew has used it earlier (v. 15), in the Sermon on the Mount. Some commentators find a connection between this verse and the preceding passage thus: 'The lamp is Christ. God has not hidden Him under the bushel. He shines for all the world—there is no need of any other "sign."' This seems too strained to be original, even if it represents the thought of Q.

bushel: a vessel to contain a certain measure of corn. For the thought of this verse and the two following see note on *v.* 36 below.

34. This and the next verse Matthew has used a little later in the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 22, 23).

single: 'sound.' *evil*: 'diseased.'

35. *the light that is in thee.* 'The organ of spiritual vision within you.'

darkness. If therefore thy whole body be full of light, having 36
no part dark, it shall be wholly full of light, as when the
lamp with its bright shining doth give thee light.

36. Peculiar to Luke. As the text stands, this verse, which is obviously meant to be connected with *v.* 35 (*therefore*), is obscure. Verse 33 stands by itself: the connection with what follows is only a verbal one in the word *lamp* (cp. 'salt,' Mark ix. 49–50). Its original context and meaning must therefore remain doubtful. But it finds a satisfactory sense where Matthew has placed it (Matthew v. 15), where it refers to the Christian's influence, which is to light up the world around. The sense of *vv.* 34 and 35 is clear enough: 'Just as in the case of the physical body, if the eye is sound, the man can see perfectly where he is going; but if the eye is diseased, the man behaves as though he was in darkness however bright the light is: so also consider whether your spiritual perception is diseased; if it is, your whole life will go completely astray.' With the present text some commentators find a continuing sense thus by stressing *whole* in the first half, *full of light* in the second: 'If thy *whole* body...it shall be wholly *full of light*...' 'Complete illumination is illumination indeed' (Plummer). But this is at best a mere repetition of *v.* 34; and platitudinous at that.

There seems to have been some confusion in the text. Some MSS omit *v.* 36, and for *v.* 35 have the parallel from Matthew. Two Latin MSS read (with slight differences) *si ergo corpus tuum, lucernam non habens lucidam, obscurum est; quanto magis, cum lucerna luceat, inluminat te.* The Syriac version is similar. This gives a possible sense: 'If your body when it has no lamp to lighten it is in darkness, how much more when the lamp shines does it illuminate you'—i.e. the density of spiritual darkness illustrates by contrast the brilliance of spiritual light.

There can be no certain solution. The verse may be an early gloss, or the variations in reading may indicate an early corruption of the text.

37–54. CRITICISM OF THE PHARISEES

Matthew has a considerably longer version of this discourse towards the end of his gospel (chap. xxiii). Where the two versions are parallel, however, critics are generally agreed that the divergence in detail between them is too great for them to have been derived from a common written source. This may be variously explained. Those who hold the Two-Document theory (i.e. Mark and Q only) suppose that at this, as at some other points, the copies of Q used by Matthew and Luke had been differently translated or edited. On a Three- or Four-Document hypothesis (i.e. one which postulates also a document M peculiar to Matthew, or L peculiar to Luke, or both) the difference will be regarded as due to conflation: i.e. either Matthew represents Q, and Luke is Q + L (with omissions of what was unsuitable for Gentiles); or more probably (with Streeter), as Luke's version comes before and

37 Now as he spake, a Pharisee asketh him to dine with him:
38 and he went in, and sat down to meat. And when the
Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed
39 before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye
Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter;
but your inward part is full of extortion and wickedness.
40 Ye foolish ones, did not he that made the outside make the
41 inside also? Howbeit give for alms those things which are
within; and behold, all things are clean unto you.

after Q material, Luke represents Q, and Matthew has conflated a discourse in Q with a similar one in M.

37. It seems incredible that Jesus should have said what follows when a guest in a Pharisee's house. If this verse and the next are historical, they seem to have been used as a peg on which to hang more than they can bear. They may have stood in Q and been omitted by Matthew because he has already given a longer discussion on the subject of ablutions. In this case Q, or Luke, may have grouped together after them several separate denunciations. More probably they are an editorial introduction to what follows.

dine. 'Here, as in John xxi. 12, 15, the early meal of breakfast or lunch is meant' (Plummer).

38. *washed.* Cp. Mark vii. 2 f., Matthew xv. 2 f. The elaborate ritual of ablution described in Mark vii. 3, 4 for the benefit of his Gentile readers appears to have been exaggerated, for it attributes to *all* Jews what was only required of priests. But any guest would be expected to use the water provided (John ii. 6) to rid himself of ritual pollution before a meal.

39–41. Verse 39 is similar to Matthew's version (Matt. xxiii. 25–26), except that Matthew has 'full *from*' instead of 'full *of*.' Verse 40 does not appear in Matthew, and for *v.* 41 Matthew has 'Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also.' Luke's version is more difficult, perhaps therefore more original. In Matthew the contrast is between the ceremonial purity of the vessels and their real defilement because their contents are the result of robbery and greed. 'Cleanse the contents first,' Jesus says, 'and then you need not trouble about ceremonial uncleanness.' In Luke the ceremonial purity of the vessels is contrasted in *v.* 39 with the defilement in the hearts of the Pharisees themselves. But *vv.* 40 and 41 are very obscure. Various solutions are suggested:

(1) If in *v.* 39 *of the cup and of the platter* is omitted as an assimilation to Matthew, the cleanness of vessels will be no longer in question. The sense will be 'You cleanse your outside but your inside is foul. (40) Did not God make inside as well as outside? (41) Cleanse' (see below) 'the inside and all is clean.'

[*give for alms those things which are within.* Wellhausen believes that 'give for alms' is the result of a mistranslation of an Aramaic word *dakkou*, 'cleanse,' as *zakkou*, 'give alms.']

But woe unto you Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and 42
every herb, and pass over judgement and the love of God:
but these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other
undone. Woe unto you Pharisees! for ye love the chief seats 43

(2) Leaving the text of *v.* 39 as it stands, but in *v.* 40 following some MSS in transposing *the outside* and *the inside*, we get the sense 'You cleanse your vessels but your hearts are foul. Has not the man who has prepared (i.e. cleansed) the inward prepared the outward too? Give alms of the contents of your vessels' (or better, as (1), 'cleanse the things of the heart') 'and all is clean.'

[The Greek word translated 'make' is used in the LXX as 'to prepare, set in order, cleanse': so also in colloquial English 'to do.' If 'give for alms' is retained, the meaning will be that generosity is a better way of securing purity before God than cleansing of vessels.]

(3) Leaving the whole passage as it stands Plummer interprets: 'Your vessels are clean but your hearts foul. Did not God who made the material universe, make men's hearts also?' (i.e. it is folly to be scrupulous about keeping material objects clean while the soul is polluted with wickedness). 'Give alms of the contents of your vessels and all is clean' (note at end of (2)).

42. (Matt. xxiii. 23.) *woe unto* is an expression not merely of anger but of pity. Lagrange calls it 'un grave avertissement sur une situation funeste.' 'Alas for...' is its best equivalent in English (Latin *vae*). Its usual translation as a mere curse has led to misunderstanding of Jesus' attitude towards the Pharisees. His criticism of them was never merely destructive: if He denounced and ridiculed them, it was because He longed to rouse them to see their faults. They would have been splendid material for Jesus, with their passionate devotion to God and country and the Law, if He could only have given them what they chiefly lacked, a true sense of proportion.

Notice the humour of this whimsical word-picture. It is as though a man were to sell even every tenth leaf of mustard and cress in his garden for the benefit of his church's funds, and then rifle the poor-box.

judgement. The word may be taken in two senses: '(human) justice, and love for God,' or 'God's justice and love.' The latter is perhaps best. The Pharisees forget God's true nature: they think He cares more for exact tithes than for the qualities that are themselves essential to His nature.

but these... undone. These words are omitted by certain authorities, and may here be an assimilation to Matthew's text. Luke would hardly have thought them suitable for his Gentile readers. In any case it seems likely that the words are a Judaistic addition in Matthew, and not an original saying of Jesus. For although He came to 'fulfil' the Law He did not do so by insisting that its *minutiae* must be observed —the words are contrary also to the spirit of the verse as a whole.

43. (Matt. xxiii. 6–7.) Luke gives a Marcan version of this saying later (Luke xx. 46 = Mark xii. 38–39).

the chief seats. 'A semicircular bench round the ark, facing the

in the synagogues, and the salutations in the marketplaces.
44 Woe unto you! for ye are as the tombs which appear not, and
the men that walk over *them* know it not.
45 And one of the lawyers answering saith unto him, Master,
46 in saying this thou reproachest us also. And he said, Woe
unto you lawyers also! for ye lade men with burdens grievous
to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with
47 one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the tombs
48 of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. So ye are
witnesses and consent unto the works of your fathers: for

congregation' (Plummer). Modern parallels to this highly-prized position may be found in the seating arrangements 'on the platform' at public meetings.

44. (Matt. xxiii. 27.) Matthew has a different simile—'whitewashed' tombs which are clean and white outside but foul inside. Luke's version refers to the danger of pollution from contact with a grave, 'Whosoever toucheth a grave shall be unclean seven days' (Num. xix. 16). Thus graves were whitened before the Passover to enable pilgrims to avoid them (this is what Matthew refers to). The Pharisees are regarded as good men, but by their influence pollute those around them unawares.

45. This verse is peculiar to Luke. Matthew has not preserved a distinction between criticisms directed against Pharisees and against scribes. In any case the distinction is artificial.

'The scribes, who were not all Pharisees (Mark ii. 16; Acts xxiii. 9), were a comparatively small body of men who (1) expounded the Law, (2) developed it, (3) administered it as assessors in courts of justice. The Pharisees were the whole body of orthodox pietists who lived the "separated" life' (McNeile on Matt. v. 20). Thus an attack on the Pharisees would be an attack on the scribes, for they were responsible for the principle, upon which the Pharisees based their religious life.

46. (Matt. xxiii. 4.) *burdens grievous to be borne.* The scribal expositions of the Law had grown into that vast collection of ritual explanations known as the Tradition of the Elders. Necessary as such explanation was originally—for the Law had to be explained to the people who had to live by it—by N.T. times it had grown to such overwhelming proportions that Jesus' words here are no exaggeration.

and ye yourselves etc. This does not mean that the scribes did not themselves observe their traditions. Such a charge would have been untrue. But they made no attempt to simplify matters for the masses, for instance, by 'repeal of past decisions' (Easton).

47–48. (Matt. xxiii. 29–31, considerably different.) This saying is difficult, both in Matthew and Luke. The usual interpretation is as follows: '"Father" according to Semitic use may mean either "ancestor" or "pattern," and this saying plays on the double meaning with savage irony' (Easton). 'You proclaim yourselves the sons of the murderers. "Sons" are those who inherit their fathers' characters'

they killed them, and ye build *their tombs*. Therefore also 49
said the wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and
apostles; and *some* of them they shall kill and persecute;
that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the 50
foundation of the world, may be required of this generation;
from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah, who 51
perished between the altar and the sanctuary: yea, I say
unto you, it shall be required of this generation. Woe unto 52
you lawyers! for ye took away the key of knowledge: ye
entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in
ye hindered.

(McNeile). 'You bear witness to the murder-taint in your blood' (W. C. Allen). That is to say, in so ostentatiously honouring the tombs of the dead prophets, they merely draw attention to the fact that they are children of murderers, a fact which is confirmed by their murderous attitude towards Jesus Himself. They too will slay the prophets whom God will send, and thus shew themselves true sons of their fathers who slew the prophets of old.

49–51. (Matt. xxiii. 34–36.) *said the wisdom of God.* Matthew puts the words that follow directly into Jesus' mouth, thus interpreting 'the Wisdom of God' as referring to Jesus. Very probably Luke himself also understood the words thus, for he substitutes *apostles* for Matthew's 'wise men and scribes,' as more appropriate to the messengers of Jesus. Jesus could not have referred to Himself thus.

The phrase may be taken as expressing Jesus' own view of God's dealings with the Jews, 'God in His Wisdom has said....' But the O.T. style and vocabulary of the passage is better explained if it is regarded as a quotation from some apocalyptic writing, either itself called 'The Wisdom of God'—none however of that name is known to have existed—or in which 'The Wisdom of God' was represented as speaking (cp. the apocryphal Book of Wisdom: also Proverbs). Easton says of the passage: 'Its tone is simply that of the ordinary apocalyptic pessimism, which regards the last generation as worst of all.'

51. The murder of Abel (Gen. iv) and Zachariah son of Jehoiada the priest (2 Chr. xxiv) were the first and last murders related in the Jewish Scriptures, in which 2 Chr. stood last. Thus the phrase means 'all the murders recorded in the Scriptures.'

Matthew has confused this Zachariah with Zachariah the prophet, and calls him 'the son of Barachiah' (Zech. i. 1).

between the altar and the sanctuary. Zachariah was killed, according to 2 Chr., 'in the court of the house of the Lord.' The great altar for burnt offerings stood in the outer court. Thus Luke's phrase means 'in the precincts of the Temple.'

52. (Matt. xxiii. 14.) This verse is the climax of the whole passage: in Matthew it is transposed to an earlier position. The scribes have

53 And when he was come out from thence, the scribes and
the Pharisees began to press upon *him* vehemently, and to
54 provoke him to speak of many things; laying wait for him,
to catch something out of his mouth.

12 In the mean time, when the many thousands of the multi-
tude were gathered together, insomuch that they trode one
upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all,
Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.

taken from men the key that will let them into the house of knowledge, and yet have not unlocked the door themselves. That is to say, they have established a monopoly of religious interpretation, and in doing so have themselves gone astray besides putting others on the wrong road.

The time is past when Jesus' denunciations of the Jewish leaders are to be regarded as wholly true of *all* the scribes and Pharisees. The evidence is strongly against this. No doubt there were numerous examples of narrow-minded and hypocritical individuals, for whom Jesus' condemnation was none too severe. But that there were many scribes and Pharisees of real piety and sincerity is incontestable; and naturally the Gospels are very silent about these—for they would not have been found among Jesus' bitter foes. Besides this it must be remembered that Jesus' words about them are the words of an antagonist—and that they have been handed down in an entirely hostile atmosphere, very favourable to exaggeration and addition. (Cp. Montefiore, Introduction, § 31: and I, p. 290 f., II, p. 295 f.) See further Appendix I, p. 259 f.

53–54. These two verses may be regarded as Luke's editorial conclusion to the section. He regards the delivery of the discourse he has just recorded as a very important point in the coming of the breach between Jesus and the Jewish leaders. Henceforth they watched for every opportunity to discredit Him.

XII. 1–12. COURAGE AND TRUST IN GOD

1. The agreement between Matthew and Luke in this section is close. Luke represents the order of Q, Matthew has separated the verses into three different contexts: thus 2–9 = Matt. x. 26–33, 10 = Matt. xii. 32, 11–12 = Matt. x. 19–20.

Luke represents *vv.* 1–12 as spoken to the disciples: at *v.* 13 the 'multitude' is mentioned. Thus *first of all* is usually understood as representing the first stage of Luke's setting for the sayings in this chapter: 'First He began to speak to His disciples'—then later to the crowd. Others have understood it to mean that the sayings were addressed 'primarily' to the disciples: or have taken it with what follows: 'Before all else beware of the leaven....'

For the use of *leaven* as a metaphor for a rapid and pervasive influence cp. the little parable in xiii. 20–21. Luke explains it here as the *hypocrisy* of the Pharisees: Matthew (in xvi. 12) as their *teaching*.

But there is nothing covered up, that shall not be revealed: 2
and hid, that shall not be known. Wherefore whatsoever ye 3
have said in the darkness shall be heard in the light; and
what ye have spoken in the ear in the inner chambers shall
be proclaimed upon the housetops. And I say unto you my 4
friends, Be not afraid of them which kill the body, and after
that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you 5
whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed
hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.
Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? and not one of 6

2–3. The connection of thought is: 'Hypocrisy is no use, for some day it will be exposed.' Matthew uses the saying in quite a different context (x. 26, 27) and Luke has already given a Marcan form of the saying at viii. 17 (see note there). The original context of the verses is quite doubtful.

3. *Wherefore.* If the Greek phrase has this meaning here, as it usually does, the sense of the verse will be that in view of the fact that everything must one day be revealed the disciples are to abandon any kind of secrecy in their preaching. But in i. 20, xix. 44, Acts xii. 23, it means 'because.' If that is the meaning here, the sense will be 'Concealment is useless: for all that you say, however secretly, will one day be published abroad.' In that case the reference will still be to the 'hypocrisy' of *v.* 1. This suits the context much better than the other interpretation, but may be less original. As Easton says, 'the futures may be eschatological,' i.e. the 'revealing' will take place at the coming of the Kingdom.

4–5. 'Let there be no concealment among *you*, through fear of any man. He, whom alone you have to fear, is God.'

4. *you my friends.* Jesus felt no fear save fear of God: it would be strange if those who shared His friendship did not catch something of His fearlessness.

5. This verse must refer to God—not, as has sometimes been thought, to the devil. Jesus would not have told His friends to fear the devil but to fight him.

hell. The Greek word used here 'is a transliteration of *Ge-Hinnom*, "Valley of Hinnom," where children were thrown into the red-hot arms of Molech. When these abominations were abolished by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 10), refuse of all kinds, including carcases of criminals, was thrown into this valley and (according to late authorities) consumed by fire, which was ceaselessly burning. Hence it became a symbolical name for the place of punishment in the other world' (Plummer, *ad loc.*). It is perhaps not quite unnecessary to point out that Jesus' use of the contemporary Jewish phrase does not imply anything with regard to His thought of God's action towards sinners.

6–7. 'God cares for every sparrow: He cares infinitely for each one of you.'

6. *five sparrows . . . two farthings*; Matthew (x. 29) has 'two sparrows

7 them is forgotten in the sight of God. But the very hairs of
your head are all numbered. Fear not: ye are of more value
8 than many sparrows. And I say unto you, Every one who
shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also
9 confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me in
the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the
10 angels of God. And every one who shall speak a word against
the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that
blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven.

for a farthing.' The difference, if unimportant, is interesting. Possibly the price of sparrows may have varied in different localities, and one writer may have adjusted it to that current in his own district: or the two prices may have been concurrent, two for ½*d.*, five for 1*d.*!

It may be useful to give a summary, at this point, of the coins current in Palestine in N.T. times:

Lepton (widow's 'mite'):	about $\frac{1}{128}$*d.*:	copper.
Kodrantes (*quadrans*) :	„ ½*d.*:	„
Assarion ('farthing') :	„ ¾*d.*:	„
Denarius ('penny') :	„ 9½*d.*:	silver.
Aureus :	25 *denarii* (£1):	gold.

There are also mentioned in the gospels the Greek *drachma*, equivalent to the *denarius*: the *mina* (=4 *aurei*): and the *talent* (=60 *minae*).

The above values in our money are the *nominal* values of the coins: their *purchasing power* would have been four or five times greater than their nominal value to-day. (See further *Peake's Commentary*, art. 'Weights, Measures, Money and Time,' by A. R. S. Kennedy.)

is forgotten in the sight of God. Matthew's phrase, 'shall fall on the ground without your Father,' is more vivid and probably original. It has been suggested that it represents an Aramaic original: 'one of them will not *hop down* to the ground without your Father.'

8–9. 'Faithful service now will find its reward when the Kingdom comes.'

9. *the angels of God* is probably a use of the Jewish paraphrase for God, cp. Matthew's phrase, 'the kingdom of heaven.'

This saying stood in Mark as well as Q, and has been reproduced from Mark in Luke ix. 26.

10. Cp. Mark iii. 28–29; Matt. xii. 31–32. Luke gives the Q form of the saying, Matthew's version is a mixture of Mark and Q.

In Mark and Matthew the saying comes in the 'Beelzebub Controversy,' after the Jews' accusation against Jesus of working by Satan's power. Luke's form of the saying appears more original. It is unlikely that Christian thought would have subordinated the Son of Man (understood as Christ) to the Spirit.

The saying has been taken to mean that while blasphemy against Christ would be forgiven, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit would not; and 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit' is explained as 'the expression of a hardened state of mind which deliberately denounces

And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the 11
rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye
shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit shall 12
teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say.

as evil that which the sinner knows to be good'—'a deliberate preference of darkness to light which makes repentance and therefore forgiveness impossible.' Of this sin Jesus held the Pharisees to be guilty.

There are three difficulties in this view: (1) How could Jesus have expected the Jews to distinguish between Himself (the Son of Man) and the Holy Spirit? If it was by the power of the Spirit that He drove out the devils, was not 'blasphemy against the Son of Man' the same thing as 'blasphemy against the Spirit'? (2) Is it consistent with Jesus' view of God as a whole to suppose that He thought of any sin as *never* to be forgiven, or any human soul as *eternally* lost? (3) The two phrases 'to blaspheme against' and 'to speak a word against' appear to be used in the various forms of the saying merely as synonyms. Can 'speaking a word against,' therefore, represent so terrible a sin as is supposed?

The best solution seems that of McNeile (*Matt.* p. 178 f.): (1) In the original Aramaic of the saying the contrast was not between 'the Son of Man' and the Holy Spirit, but between *man* and the Spirit. Thus the phrase *son of man* in Luke represents 'man' simply (cp. v. 24 note); and the same contrast between *man* and the Spirit was expressed in the Aramaic underlying the Marcan form of the saying. (2) In Jewish phraseology serious sin was often spoken of as unforgivable. This can be seen in the O.T. (Num. xv. 30, 31; 1 Sam. iii. 13, 14; Isa. xxii. 14) and is found in Rabbinic writings. 'If the Lord spoke as a Jew to Jews, and used a type of expression current in His day, and derived from the O.T., He meant, and would be understood to mean, no more than that blasphemy' (the Greek word meant 'slander' in classical times) 'against the Holy Spirit, by whose power He worked, was a terrible sin—more terrible than blasphemy against man.'

It seems impossible to establish any satisfactory connection of thought between this verse and the preceding section.

11–12. Matt. x. 19–20. Also in Mark xiii. 11, and paraphrased in Luke xxi. 14–15.

11. *before the synagogues.* 'The elders of the synagogue were responsible for discipline. They held courts and could sentence to excommunication or scourging' (Plummer).

be not anxious. The meaning of this word is best illustrated by *vv.* 22 f. below. It is a strong word, of which the root idea is division or bewilderment of mind. The A.V. translation 'take no thought' was a strong phrase in Elizabethan English—Lady Catherine Parr is said to have died of 'taking thought'—but has led to serious misconceptions in modern use. The equivalent in modern English is 'Do not be consumed with anxiety about....' In the passage below Jesus is *not* telling the disciples to sit down with folded hands and wait for God to drop everything into their lap: what He says is 'Do not be always

13 And one out of the multitude said unto him, Master, bid
14 my brother divide the inheritance with me. But he said unto
15 him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? And
he said unto them, Take heed, and keep yourselves from all
covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance
16 of the things which he possesseth. And he spake a parable
unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought

worrying about food and clothes and so on; they are not the most important things in the long run; do your best and trust in God for the rest.'

13–21. GOD AND THE RICH MAN

This section appears in Luke only.

13–14. It was not unusual for Rabbis to settle disputes of this kind which involved the interpretation of the Law. We know nothing of the man's situation, and it is impossible to say whether his claim was just or not, though as his remark is recorded here it shews less desire for arbitration than for compulsion. The words of Jesus' answer are reminiscent of Ex. ii. 14, where an Israelite says to Moses, 'Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?'

Loisy regards the incident as unhistorical—invented, or developed, out of the Exodus passage, to serve as an introduction to the parable which follows. There is something to be said for this view, for (1) Luke was obviously anxious, as a general rule, to provide a suitable setting for his material: there is a somewhat similar verse, for instance, before the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 29 note). (2) Unless it is to be assumed that the man's claim was unjust, the use of the word 'covetousness' in *v.* 15 and the moral of the parable itself do not appear to have a very close connection with the incident. (3) It is not easy to understand Jesus' motive for His answer. 'Matters of this kind lay outside His province,' 'the man was making an unjust claim on Jesus, and invading His time' are specimens of the way in which it is usually explained. Few will feel them satisfactory. If the incident is historical, the circumstances—which we do not know—must surely have been such as to make Jesus feel that in this particular case He would have done more harm than good by any action. Without such circumstances His answer seems unnaturally brusque and unsympathetic.

In any case, it is obviously quite illegitimate to use the passage, as it is sometimes used to-day, to justify the thesis that Christianity should confine itself to things spiritual, and not attempt to make its influence felt in the world of practical affairs.

14. *Man.* Commentators note this as 'a severe form of address,' apparently forgetting its use in v. 20 to the paralytic.

15. *for a man's life... possesseth.* The Greek cannot mean this. The best translation is Moffatt's 'a man's *life* is not part of his possessions because he has ample wealth.' A man may have all else that he desires, but his life is never his own.

forth plentifully: and he reasoned within himself, saying, 17
What shall I do, because I have not where to bestow my
fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, 18
and build greater; and there will I bestow all my corn and
my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much 19
goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink,
be merry. But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this 20
night is thy soul required of thee; and the things which thou
hast prepared, whose shall they be? So is he that layeth up 21
treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.

And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, 22
Be not anxious for *your* life, what ye shall eat; nor yet for
your body, what ye shall put on. For the life is more than 23
the food, and the body than the raiment. Consider the 24
ravens, that they sow not, neither reap; which have no store-
chamber nor barn; and God feedeth them: of how much
more value are ye than the birds! And which of you by 25
being anxious can add a cubit unto his stature? If then ye 26

19. *to my soul.* (Cp. ix. 24 note.) Both in this verse and the next the Greek word *psychē* has the meaning of the principle of *physical* existence, in *v.* 19 considered particularly as the enjoyment of physical sensations. 'Soul' is quite a wrong translation. 'Life' is the nearest English equivalent.

21. *rich toward God* is a vague expression, and variously explained as referring to spiritual riches, almsgiving, or, more generally, to not letting the acquiring of riches divert the attention from God.

22–34. TRUST IN GOD

From Q. Matthew has altered the order of part of this section: 22–31 = Matt. vi. 25–33, 33–34 = Matt. vi. 19–21.

23. Matthew gives this verse as a rhetorical question, probably original. Also the last sentence of the next verse.

24. *ravens.* Matt. 'the birds of the heaven.' Matthew may have substituted a frequent O.T. phrase: or Luke may have introduced the ravens because of such passages as Job xxxviii. 41, 'Who provideth for the raven his food?' or Ps. cxlvii. 9, 'He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry.'

As McNeile says: 'The birds are an example not of idleness but of freedom from anxiety.' They are not always worrying that the supply of worms may run out: yet they do not expect the worms to crawl down their beaks.

25. *stature.* The ancient versions, and apparently Matthew also, understood the Greek word to mean 'height.' But it seems certain that in Luke the meaning is 'age, length of life.' For to add a 'cubit'

are not able to do even that which is least, why are ye anxious
27 concerning the rest? Consider the lilies, how they grow:
they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, Even
Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.
28 But if God doth so clothe the grass in the field, which to-day
is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more
29 *shall he clothe* you, O ye of little faith? And seek not ye what
ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubt-
30 ful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world
seek after: but your Father knoweth that ye have need of
31 these things. Howbeit seek ye his kingdom, and these things
32 shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your
33 Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell that

to one's height could hardly be called *even that which is least* (*v.* 26), and as a matter of fact few people would be particularly anxious that it should be added. But to prolong his life was exactly what the rich man in the parable would have given all he had to do. The Greek word translated *cubit* will then be used here of a short period of time. Creed compares the Hebrew of Ps. xxxix. 5, 'Behold, thou hast made my days hand-breadths.'

26. 'So if you cannot by worrying prolong your life even for a single moment, why worry about anything else?' Matt. 'And why are ye anxious concerning raiment?' which is simpler, and more suitable to what immediately follows.

27. The thought behind this verse is that no artificial beauty can be so beautiful as the natural freshness of a wild flower.

28. Easton says: 'In Palestine dried grass is still used extensively for cooking, and the custom of heating the interior of an oven before baking still prevails likewise.' But probably use as fuel is meant, without reference to this latter custom.

29. *neither be ye of doubtful mind*: i.e. 'neither be ye anxious.'

30. *the nations of the world.* Matthew simply 'the Gentiles.' Luke alters this for his Gentile readers. He wishes to avoid the sense of 'the Gentiles' as opposed to the Jews, and writes 'the nations of the world,' i.e. 'non-Christians.'

The sense is 'Do not worry. The heathen worry; they do not know the Father-God. But you know Him; and a father cares for his children's needs. If only (*v.* 31) you seek to do God's will, you may leave the rest to Him.'

32. Peculiar to Luke. The verse may be taken either with what precedes or with what follows. Whether he composed the verse himself or found it in Q, Luke no doubt regarded it as a transition from *v.* 31 to *v.* 33. 'Seek God's kingdom, and have no fear that your search will fail. Your Father will give you the kingdom, so do not shrink from renouncing all else.'

33–34. (Matt. vi. 19–21.) Verse 34 is almost exactly parallel to

ye have, and give alms; make for yourselves purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief draweth near, neither moth destroyeth. For where 34
your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning; 35
and be ye yourselves like unto men looking for their lord, 36
when he shall return from the marriage feast; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may straightway open unto him.
Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh 37
shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them sit down to meat, and shall come and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, 38
and if in the third, and find *them* so, blessed are those *servants*.

Matthew. For *v.* 33 Matthew has 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.' Of Matthew McNeile says: 'The parallelism and tautology of Matthew are Hebraic and probably nearer to the original. He gives a genuine picture of Oriental wealth, garments, etc. stored in barbaric abundance, too numerous for use.' Luke appears to have developed the saying along eschatological lines. The Kingdom is near: earthly possessions should be abandoned and heavenly acquired instead. 'Luke's form corresponds to the heightened enthusiasm of the primitive Jerusalem church' (Easton).

Jesus' words to the rich young man in Mark x. 21, 'Sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven,' may well have contributed to the form of the saying as Luke gives it.

35–40. WATCHFULNESS

Verses 35–38 do not appear in Matthew, but after the next paragraph (*vv.* 39–46) Matthew (xxv. 1 ff.) gives the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, which has the same point. It is therefore probable that the verses stood in Q (Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 279).

For the eschatological question as it is raised by the remainder of this chapter, and the first nine verses of the next, see Appendix I, p. 262 f.

35. *girded about*: i.e. with the long Eastern garments tucked out of the way so as to permit greater activity.

37. 'Faithful servants will be rewarded: the master himself will serve them a feast.' Perhaps there is a reference to the Messianic banquet, which the faithful were to share in the Kingdom.

38. The Romans divided the night into four watches (as in Mark xiii. 35: 'whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning'), the Jews into three (Judg. vii. 19, 'the middle watch'). The watches named here may be the second and third of the Roman

39 But know this, that if the master of the house had known in
what hour the thief was coming, he would have watched,
40 and not have left his house to be broken through. Be ye also
ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh.
41 And Peter said, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us,
42 or even unto all? And the Lord said, Who then is the faithful
and wise steward, whom his lord shall set over his household,
43 to give them their portion of food in due season? Blessed is
that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so
44 doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will set him over
45 all that he hath. But if that servant shall say in his heart,
My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the
menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and drink,
46 and to be drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in
a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he
knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his
47 portion with the unfaithful. And that servant, which knew

four, or the two last of the Jewish three: probably the latter. The first watch is omitted because the wedding would not be over till after it was past.

39–40. (Matt. xxiv. 43–44: Matthew has embodied this section of Q (Luke xii. 39–46 (except 41)) in his eschatological discourse). The Son of Man is compared to a thief in the suddenness of His coming.

41–48. THE FAITHFUL STEWARD

42–46 = Matt. xxiv. 45–51, 41 and 47–48 peculiar to Luke.

41. Luke has probably supplied this verse himself, to make clearer what he regards as the meaning of the parable that follows, namely the special responsibilities of Christian leaders. If the parable is original it will have referred to the Apostles, and possibly to the Jewish leaders in *vv.* 45–46. If it is later than Jesus, the reference will be to Church leaders, some of whom are already going astray: Luke so interprets it.

42. *steward.* Matt. 'servant.' Luke substitutes a word more suitable to his interpretation of the parable.

45. This verse suggests a date for the parable at which the immediate expectation of the Coming was to some extent dwindling, and abuses were springing up in the Church.

46. *cut him asunder.* Either literally, 'cut him in half'—references to such a death are found in the O.T. (2 Sam. xii. 31, for instance)—or figuratively, 'separate him off, cast him out.'

47–48. *that servant* is the same person as in *vv.* 43 and 45. His responsibility is looked at from a different angle, that of knowledge of his master's will (cp. Amos iii. 2, 'You only have I known of all the

his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*; but he that knew 48
not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more.

I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I, if it is 49
already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptized with; 50
and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! Think ye 51
that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, Nay;

families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities'). As in *v.* 46, here too his punishment will be severe. He who errs in ignorance will be punished less severely. If the parable is original, the reference will be to the uneducated Jews as opposed to their leaders: if not, to the laity as opposed to the clergy.

48. The two parallel sections of the last half of this verse mean the same thing. 'Great opportunities bring great responsibilities.'

49–53. STRIFE

49–50 are peculiar to Luke. 51 and 53 are parallel to Matt. x. 34–36, but with considerable differences (52 is Luke only). See note below.

49. *fire*: the sense of burning strife and division, when men are faced with the choice for or against Jesus.

what will I, if it is already kindled? This enigmatic phrase is best understood as the equivalent of two Hebrew idioms by which 'what' = 'how' and 'if' expresses a wish. Thus the sense is 'How I wish it were already kindled!' (See Lagrange and Easton, *ad loc.*)

50. *a baptism.* Cp. Mark x. 38 f., where Jesus uses the same metaphor (in answer to James and John) for the plunge into the waters of affliction. It occurs frequently in O.T., e.g. Isa. xliii. 2: 'When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee.' If Jesus had this passage in mind, it is just possible that the 'fire' of *v.* 49 should be understood of a fiery trial.

how am I straitened till it be accomplished! The weariness and sadness of these two verses is the best guarantee of their authenticity. There is little trace here of exultant fanaticism pressing triumphantly forward to a catastrophic climax. Jesus longs for the coming of the Kingdom, but knows that it can only come through His own death: and in His full humanity the horror of what is in front of Him presses heavily on His soul.

51–53. The description of divisions in a family in *v.* 53 is founded on Micah vii. 6: 'The son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter in law against her mother in law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house.' Matthew's version

52 but rather division: for there shall be from henceforth five
in one house divided, three against two, and two against
53 three. They shall be divided, father against son, and son
against father; mother against daughter, and daughter
against her mother; mother in law against her daughter in
law, and daughter in law against her mother in law.
54 And he said to the multitudes also, When ye see a cloud
rising in the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a
55 shower; and so it cometh to pass. And when *ye see* a south
wind blowing, ye say, There will be a scorching heat; and it
56 cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites, ye know how to interpret the
face of the earth and the heaven; but how is it that ye know
57 not how to interpret this time? And why even of yourselves
58 judge ye not what is right? For as thou art going with thine
adversary before the magistrate, on the way give diligence
to be quit of him; lest haply he hale thee unto the judge, and

(x. 34–36) is simpler, and reproduces the Micah verse more closely. Matthew probably represents Q, which Luke has expanded. He adds *v.* 52 to introduce *v.* 53.

52. 'Three against two,' because the 'mother' and 'mother-in-law' of the next verse are the same person.

54–59. SIGNS OF THE TIMES

54. *in the west*, 'and therefore from the Mediterranean Sea, which was a sign of rain' (Plummer).

56. Lagrange has an interesting note: 'When it is a question of the weather they know how to draw conclusions and that quickly. With regard to Jesus they shuffle; and, now sympathetic, now indifferent, now hostile, they act a true play. "Hypocrites" has here something of its sense of "actors." The feelings of actors are on the surface and change quickly. This fickle crowd has not realised the gravity of the circumstances' (*Luc*, p. 375). Cp. vi. 42 note.

57. Possibly supplied by Luke to connect *vv.* 56 and 58. They do not understand the signs of the times, and so do not realise the need for immediate repentance.

of yourselves seems to mean 'without warning from anyone else,' i.e. apart from Jesus' work.

58–59. These verses appear in a somewhat different form as part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 25–26). Their context is good in Luke, rather strained in Matthew. The difference in form may be due to alterations by both evangelists, Matthew to suit his altered context, Luke to improve the style.

The point of the illustration is that no debtor would allow a case against him to go into court, where he could only expect the strictest severity, if he could by any means settle the matter first with his

the judge shall deliver thee to the officer, and the officer shall cast thee into prison. I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no 59
means come out thence, till thou have paid the very last mite.

Now there were some present at that very season which 13
told him of the Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled
with their sacrifices. And he answered and said unto them, 2
Think ye that these Galilæans were sinners above all the
Galilæans, because they have suffered these things? I tell 3

creditor. 'Creditors must usually have been willing to accept a compromise from a bankrupt debtor, for imprisoning him brought no financial advantage; the compromise might consist of labour or of arrangements to pay by instalments' (Easton). There is no need to regard it as an allegory: its moral is the necessity for repentance before it is too late.

58. *the officer.* Luke means the Levite policemen who attended the local synagogue court to carry out the sentences.

59. *mite*: see note on *vv.* 6–7 above.

XIII. 1–3. PILATE AND THE GALILEANS

In *vv.* 1–9 the appeal for repentance is carried on from the end of chap. xii.

We have no other knowledge of this incident. Apparently some Galileans had come to Jerusalem to sacrifice, and had caused some kind of trouble. Pilate had dealt with them severely by means of soldiers from the garrison. Lagrange suggests that the cause of the massacre was some kind of Messianic revolt—the Zealot movement arose, and was most widely spread, in Galilee.

1. *Pilate.* Cp. iii. 1 note. Josephus and Philo describe Pilate's character and actions as mercilessly ferocious. He was full of brutal contempt for the Jews and did not shrink from wanton insults to their religion. He was eventually recalled to Rome in A.D. 36 to answer to the Emperor for the severity with which he had crushed a rising in Samaria, and was banished to Gaul. For the apparent contradiction between this view of him and his attitude as represented by the evangelists in the Passion-Story, see notes there.

mingled with their sacrifices. This language suggests, but does not necessarily imply, that those concerned were killed actually in the Temple.

2–3. The O.T. view of the problem of evil and suffering is expressed in Ezek. xviii. 20, 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him': i.e. that in this life each individual gets exactly what he deserves of prosperity

you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner
4 perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam
fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above
5 all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but,
except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.
6 And he spake this parable; A certain man had a fig tree
planted in his vineyard; and he came seeking fruit thereon,
7 and found none. And he said unto the vinedresser, Behold,

and adversity—prosperity in proportion to his goodness, adversity in proportion to his wickedness. The object of the book of Job was to point out that in experience this is not true: and apparently Jesus Himself did not accept it. Compare with this passage John ix. 2, 3, 'Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents.' Also Matt. v. 45, 'He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.'

For a modern treatment of the problem see Streeter, *Reality* (Macmillan, 1926); also, more simply, L. Dougall, *God's Way with Man* (S. C. M. 1923).

3. *ye shall all in like manner perish.* It is quite possible that the evangelist saw in these words a reference to the war with Rome and the fall of Jerusalem, in which the sufferings of the Jews would present a parallel to the Galileans' death. But although Jesus may have foreseen the inevitability of such a conflict in the near future, His words here must be taken as referring to the final judgement of God. For as He denies that the Galileans' violent death is God's punishment for sin, so He would not picture God as about to visit a refusal to repent with any similar penalty. On the contrary He warns the Jews that whereas it is fallacious to estimate culpability by material adversity, they themselves are in very real danger of spiritual condemnation.

4–5. THE TOWER AT SILOAM

The moral is the same. Jesus speaks of the accident as recent and familiar. Peculiar to Luke.

4. *Siloam.* The aqueduct which brought water from the hill south-east of Jerusalem, and also the pool into which it opened (cp. John ix. 7). The form of the name is from the LXX—the Hebrew is Shelah or Shiloah (Neh. iii. 15; Isa. viii. 6). Lagrange says that archaeological excavations have found traces of a tower near the aqueduct (*Luc*, p. 380).

6–9. THE BARREN FIG-TREE

This parable is peculiar to Luke. Its relation to the 'Cursing of the Fig-tree' in Mark xi. 12 f.; Matt. xxi. 18 f. is doubtful. Luke omits the Marcan incident either because he had already told this parable, or because he thought its teaching dangerous. It is quite possible that the Lucan parable may have been developed into the Marcan miracle

these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why doth it also cumber the ground? And he answering saith unto him, Lord, let it alone this year 8
also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it: and if it bear fruit 9
thenceforth, *well*; but if not, thou shalt cut it down.

And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the 10
sabbath day. And behold, a woman which had a spirit of 11
infirmity eighteen years; and she was bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up. And when Jesus saw her, 12
he called her, and said to her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands upon her: and imme- 13
diately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the 14
ruler of the synagogue, being moved with indignation because Jesus had healed on the sabbath, answered and said to the multitude, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the day of the sabbath. But the Lord answered him, and said, Ye 15

in the course of tradition. It should be compared with the allegory in Isa. v. 1–7.

The lesson of the parable is the same as that of the preceding sections—the necessity for repentance since the time is short.

7. Some see here a reference to the three years of Jesus' ministry.

8. *I shall dig about it.* I.e. to loosen the soil round the roots, and admit air.

10–17. THE BENT WOMAN

Peculiar to Luke

10. There does not seem to be any connection with the last section. The mention of Jesus as teaching in a synagogue suggests that the incident occurred early in the Ministry, and stood in Luke's source without any chronological note.

11. *a spirit of infirmity.* This suggests that Luke thought of the case as one of possession by an evil spirit—as, for instance, in xi. 14, 'he was casting out a dumb spirit.' From the rest of the story it appears that the woman suffered from curvature of the spine, and that Jesus healed her by laying His hands on her. Lagrange thinks that the phrase need not be too literally pressed, and that it may indicate 'a malign influence caused by the demon.' But it is more satisfactory to suppose that the phrase is due to Luke's too literal interpretation of Jesus' words in *v.* 16, 'whom Satan had bound.'

14. For the objection to healing on the sabbath cp. the story of the Man with the Withered Hand (vi. 6–11).

15. The 'hypocrisy' of the ruler and those who agreed with him is usually considered to consist 'in veiling hatred for Christ under zeal for the Law.' The Law itself, if naturally interpreted, allows care for

hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose
his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?
16 And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham,
whom Satan had bound, lo, *these* eighteen years, to have
17 been loosed from this bond on the day of the sabbath? And
as he said these things, all his adversaries were put to shame:
and all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that
were done by him.
18 He said therefore, Unto what is the kingdom of God like?
19 and whereunto shall I liken it? It is like unto a grain of
mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his own
garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the

animals on the sabbath, and therefore how much more for sick men and women? But their hatred of Him makes them pretend that their consciences tell them this is wrong. If given a rather wider application, the word may express Jesus' disgust at such a perversion of religious zeal as to imagine that to abstain from doing a good action *could* be according to the Father's will.

With the words that follow cp. xiv. 5 below. The Law expressly permitted the leading of animals to water.

16. The purpose of the Sabbath Law was Israel's good: should not then this Israelite be allowed to benefit on the sabbath, much more than the animals of those who would not have lifted a finger to help her?

whom Satan had bound. Satan is regarded as the source of all evil. Cp. Job i. 6, and Paul's words in 2 Cor. xii. 7, 'a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me.'

18–21. THE MUSTARD AND THE LEAVEN

Somewhat different versions of the Mustard Seed parable stood in Mark (iv. 30–32) and Q. Luke, as usual, omits the Marcan parallel and uses the Q version. Matthew (xiii. 31–32) combines the two. The Leaven followed in Q (Matt. xiii. 33).

The context in Luke is poor. In Mark the Mustard Seed follows the Sower and the Seed Growing Secretly. If the three parables were originally spoken together, Jesus may have desired to encourage His disciples by them. They must not be disappointed, He says, even if the visible results of their toil and His seem very discouraging. For (the Sower) their message depends for its success largely on the character of those who receive it—on many it can have no effect at all: besides (the Growing Seed) God is behind them; they can only do their best and leave the rest to Him: and, what is more (the Mustard), the smallest beginnings often produce the greatest results.

19. 'The only cultivated member of the mustard family is the *Sinapis nigra.* It is commonly planted in gardens, has a seed that is

heaven lodged in the branches thereof. And again he said, 20
Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like unto 21
leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened.

And he went on his way through cities and villages, 22
teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem. And one said 23
unto him, Lord, are they few that be saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, 24
I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath 25
shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, open to us; and he shall answer and say to you, I know you not whence ye are; then 26
shall ye begin to say, We did eat and drink in thy presence,

proverbially small, grows rapidly to a height of 10–12 feet, and attracts birds to its branches to eat its seeds (although not for nesting). Hence this plant answers entirely to the description in the parable' (Easton, *ad loc.*).

20–21. The point of this parable is the same. The small quantity of yeast gradually leavens the whole lump of dough.

22–30. THE NARROW DOOR

23–24. Matt. vii. 13–14. It seems doubtful if there is enough correspondence between the two versions to refer the saying to Q. Streeter (p. 283) thinks that Luke represents Q while Matthew has conflated Q with his special source.

24. The questioner asks if few only will share the Messianic kingdom. Jesus answers by warning him that only those who make a strenuous effort will be rewarded. Luke's metaphor in this and the next verse is that of entry to a *house*, Matthew's to a *road*.

25. This goes closely with *v.* 24, 'They will not be able to get in, when once the master of the house has got up and shut the door.' The metaphor may be that of a feast; the host shuts the door when all the guests are assembled: or simply of a householder locking up for the night when he knows that all his family are indoors.

This verse is similar to Matt. xxv. 10–12, in the parable of the Wise and Foolish Maidens. If Luke represents Q, Matthew may have omitted the saying here because of its resemblance to the parable he was going to use later.

26–28. Cp. Matt. vii. 22–23, which seems to be a revised edition of Luke, adapted to later Christian circumstances.

26. Some commentators think the language here is allegorical. '"We did eat and drink in thy presence" is most naturally interpreted as "we have been guests of the covenant"' (Easton). But it seems simpler to take the words literally: the Jews of Palestine had seen

27 and thou didst teach in our streets; and he shall say, I tell
you, I know not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye
28 workers of iniquity. There shall be the weeping and gnashing
of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,
and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and yourselves
29 cast forth without. And they shall come from the east and
west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in
30 the kingdom of God. And behold, there are last which shall
be first, and there are first which shall be last.

and known Jesus when He lived among them; but that in itself will not help them.

28. The English version conceals the force of *There*. 'Where you are—in the place to which you will be banished—there shall be weeping...' is the meaning.

The Greek word may mean either the 'gnashing' of fury, or more probably the 'chattering' of terror. The phrase is a stereotyped refrain, characteristic of apocalyptic description, which occurs six times in Matthew, here only in Luke, not at all in Mark.

29. This verse is similar to Matt. viii. 11, at the end of the story of the Centurion at Capernaum. The original contrast in these verses is between Jews and Gentiles, though Luke himself seems to be thinking throughout the whole section rather of Christians and non-Christians, whether Jews or not.

30. This verse = Mark x. 31, reproduced in Matt. xix. 30 and xx. 16. In many cases earthly judgements and values will be found to be wrong, and superseded by truer ones. In Mark the verse refers particularly to wealth and power as signs of greatness: here the thought is that many of the Jews, God's chosen people, will be found to be 'last' and the despised Gentiles 'first.' It is important to preserve the saying's indefinite character—'there are last who shall be first' is not the same as 'the last shall be first.' Jesus did not conceive of God's judgement as a mechanical reversal of human judgement, but emphasised the fact that in many cases human judgement may be wrong.

The passage as a whole expresses Jesus' realisation of the fact that His own people for the most part would not accept Him, and leads up to the lament in *vv.* 34, 35.

31–33. HEROD THE FOX

Peculiar to Luke

This section is closely connected with the last (*In that very hour*), though the connection may be due to Luke himself. If the passage stood in Q, Matthew may have omitted it as without interest for the Christian Church of his time. Compare with it Amos vii. 10–17 (in which Loisy sees the origin of the present passage), where Amaziah

In that very hour there came certain Pharisees, saying to 31
him, Get thee out, and go hence: for Herod would fain kill
thee. And he said unto them, Go and say to that fox, Behold, 32
I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow,
and the third *day* I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on 33
my way to-day and to-morrow and the *day* following: for it
cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. O Jeru- 34

the priest of Bethel tries to frighten Amos out of Israel into Judah by denouncing him to Jeroboam.

31. Jesus is in Herod's dominions, i.e. either in Galilee or Peraea. If we are to trust Luke's representation of the incident as occurring on the 'journey to Jerusalem,' Peraea is meant: but Galilee seems more natural. In this case the incident will have occurred earlier.

Herod has already shewn interest in Jesus in ix. 7 above. Here he is definitely hostile. Some think that at the earlier point (Mark vi. 14, parallel to Luke ix. 7) 'Mark's source recorded some hostile activity on Herod's part, which has disappeared from the present Gospel' (Creed). If it was this, as seems likely, which necessitated Jesus' departure from Herod's dominions, one can understand its disappearance. The Pharisees are apparently friendly.

32. *that fox.* If the fox is to be understood as a type of cunning, the words will refer to Herod's crafty character. In Rabbinic literature, however, the fox is said to be more often used as a type of general worthlessness and insignificance.

32–33. 'My work will go on its appointed course,' says Jesus, 'till it is finished: I shall leave Herod's dominions before long, for I must make my way to Jerusalem—but not because I am afraid of Herod.' The saying is obscure in its present form: Wellhausen suggests that *and the third day I am perfected* and *to-day and to-morrow and* (33) are additions to the original saying, which would then read 'Behold I cast out devils and perform healings to-day and to-morrow. But I must go on the next day....'

I am perfected: 'brought to the end,' i.e. in death.

34–35. JESUS LAMENTS OVER JERUSALEM

Matt. xxiii. 37–39

The parallel in Matthew is almost exact, but the context different—when Jesus is at Jerusalem at the end of His life. Critics sharply disagree as to which is original. 'Luke's position for this saying is strained, while in Matthew it comes in naturally at the end of the woes on the Pharisees. Matthew is doubtless original' (Easton). 'A far more original context in Luke' (Streeter). There is a certain naturalness in Luke's connection. Jesus is thinking (in *v.* 32) of His approaching visit to Jerusalem, and laments bitterly that it is too late now for Him to save it in the judgement that was coming. On the other hand, *v.* 35 is more easily interpreted in Matthew's context (see note below).

salem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen *gathereth* her
35 own brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you *desolate*: and I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

14 And it came to pass, when he went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on a sabbath to eat bread, that

34. *how often.* This suggests, though it does not prove, that Jesus had visited Jerusalem several times. As is well known, this is not stated by the Synoptists but by the Fourth Gospel. Jesus *may* have meant 'How often have I longed to save you, and now that I have come at last you will not let Me,' but it is more natural to take His words as implying former visits to Jerusalem. Apart from the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, it is on general grounds entirely probable that Jesus should have more than once visited Jerusalem, the centre of His people's religion.

would I . . . and ye would not. These words sum up, with a deep pathos, the history of Jesus' relations with His own people. All His Ministry through He was consumed by a burning desire to win them; and continually oppressed by a heavier burden of disappointment and misunderstanding.

35. The words *Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord* (Ps. cxviii. 26) were used to welcome pilgrims who came up to Jerusalem for a festival, as they came near the Temple. They were also used of the Messiah's coming. The sense of the saying as a whole, therefore, will differ according to its context. (1) Luke: 'They will not see Him again till He comes as a Passover Pilgrim.' (2) Matthew: 'They will not see Him again till He comes in glory as the Heavenly Messiah.' This is the easier interpretation—'Jesus, speaking on the eve of His Passion, affirms that He will next be seen as the returning Messiah' (Creed)—and suggests that Matthew's context is the better.

XIV. 1–6. A MAN WITH DROPSY HEALED

1–4 are peculiar to Luke. A saying similar to *vv.* 5, 6 is given by Matthew in the story of the Withered Hand (Matt. xii. 11–12). For the setting see note on *v.* 7 below.

Some commentators regard this story as a doublet of the Withered Hand. But, as Easton says, 'that Jesus' controversy with the Pharisees on the important matter of the legality of sabbath cures was limited to a single occasion is obviously impossible, and there is not the slightest reason why tradition should not have preserved more instances than one.' Yet the circumstances of the Pharisee's invitation (if historical) suggest an earlier stage in Jesus' Ministry than that at which Luke places it.

they were watching him. And behold, there was before him 2
a certain man which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering 3
spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to
heal on the sabbath, or not? But they held their peace. And 4
he took him, and healed him, and let him go. And he said 5
unto them, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen
into a well, and will not straightway draw him up on a
sabbath day? And they could not answer again unto these 6
things.

And he spake a parable unto those which were bidden, 7
when he marked how they chose out the chief seats; saying
unto them, When thou art bidden of any man to a marriage 8
feast, sit not down in the chief seat; lest haply a more
honourable man than thou be bidden of him, and he that 9

2. The man may have obtained admission, as it would be easy to do in the East, with the hope of being cured; or Luke may imply that he had been brought there by the Pharisees to entrap Jesus.

4. *they held their peace*: either because they were afraid to argue with Him, especially when He had put the question so bluntly: or because they wanted to see what He would do.

5. Instead of *an ass* many MSS read *a son*. 'Son or ox' is startling and makes the argument more complex. The thought will then be, 'If on the sabbath you help one who is bound to you by a tie of affection, or even a valuable animal that belongs to you, why condemn me now?' instead of the simpler, 'If on the sabbath you will succour an animal in trouble, how much more ought I to help a suffering man!'

7–14. HUMILITY AND PRIDE

Peculiar to Luke

7. *a parable.* This word is rather difficult as it stands. Lagrange takes it as indicative of the general nature of Jesus' words which follow. He notices the guests' scrupulous observance of precedence, waits till all are seated, and then rebukes them in words courteously indirect. But it cannot be denied that the whole passage *vv.* 7–14 (Jesus' rebuke to guests and host) does not seem suitable to the situation, as Luke represents it, where Jesus was Himself the Pharisee's guest. It is therefore better to conclude that the setting of *vv.* 1–24 in the Pharisee's house is an editorial device; i.e. that Luke has thus linked together four sections (The Man with Dropsy, Rebuke to the Guests, to the Host, and the Great Supper), the last three of which appeared to him to gain point by such a setting, as they were all concerned with a banquet. In this particular section Luke may have seen a parabolic meaning in the words as he records them. 'The proper behaviour at a feast affords an analogy to the attitude demanded by the Kingdom of God' (Creed).

bade thee and him shall come and say to thee, Give this man place; and then thou shalt begin with shame to take
10 the lowest place. But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest place; that when he that hath bidden thee cometh, he may say to thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have glory in the presence of all that sit at meat with
11 thee. For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

12 And he said to him also that had bidden him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy

10. The motive implied in this verse is difficult, and has produced various solutions. It is objected that the passage as it stands 'makes the desire for honour the motive of humility.'

(1) Interpreting the passage as truly 'parabolic,' i.e. as illustrating and suggesting human action towards God, Rashdall says: 'I imagine that to win the favour of God would have seemed to Jesus too pure a motive to be identified with ordinary ambition or love of honour. And no one could well demur to His thinking so, if only the conception of God is kept high and pure enough. There cannot be too much desire to be approved by One whose judgements are absolutely just' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 187).

(2) The whole passage may be taken as having no parabolic meaning, i.e. 'merely as a piece of practical advice,' possibly partly humorous. 'Don't push yourself forward,' says Jesus, 'if you do, your triumph may be short-lived: keep yourself in the background, and then very likely all your pushing rivals may have the humiliation of seeing you promoted over their heads.' Of this Rashdall says (*loc. cit.*): 'It is not bad or degrading advice to say "It is better to leave it to others to give you a high place than to take it yourself." But this does not seem to me much in the spirit of Jesus. . . . It is quite possible that the Evangelist or tradition may have given some genuine saying of Jesus a turn which made it a warning against undue ambition for ecclesiastical office.'

11. This saying occurs again in xviii. 14 at the end of the 'Pharisee and Publican': and also in Matt. xxiii. 12 among the denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees. It may have stood in Q, perhaps without indication of context: although, as Streeter says, 'for a short proverbial saying of this kind there is really no need to postulate a written source at all' (p. 285). Luke, or his source, has found two appropriate occasions for it.

12–14. Again the setting strikes one as unsuitable (note on *v.* 7 above). Moreover it is probable that Luke's tendency to emphasise the duty of charity towards the poor has led him to narrow the force of Jesus' words. It is quite possible that, as Easton suggests, Luke meant the words to be understood as 'The only banquets Christians should give are feasts for the poor.' But such cannot have been Jesus' view—for He valued too highly the joys of friendship and family life.

brethren, nor thy kinsmen, nor rich neighbours; lest haply they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, bid the poor, the maimed, 13 the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; because they 14 have not *wherewith* to recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just.

And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard 15 these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat

He Himself was present at the 'Great Reception' Levi held in his house (v. 29). But He may well have felt that far too many invitations were issued from motives of self-interest, and that such hospitality was worthless: so He pleads for disinterested hospitality. Cp. vi. 33–35: 'If you love those who love you, what credit is that to you?' etc.

12. *lest haply etc.* This seems to be humorously sarcastic. 'If you don't look out they'll invite you back—and then how upset you'll be!'

14. *in the resurrection of the just.* In several passages in the N.T. the idea of resurrection seems to be confined to the 'righteous': cp. Luke xx. 35. This is in accordance with popular Jewish conceptions of a resurrection of the just, and a general resurrection followed by universal judgement. For the latter cp. John v. 29; Acts xxiv. 15; Rev. xx. 12.

For a discussion of the place of future reward and punishment in Jesus' teaching, and its bearing on ethical values, see Rashdall's *Conscience and Christ*, Appendix II. Also, more fully, *Christianity and Immortality*, V. F. Storr, Chapter II, and *Immortality*, ed. Streeter, Essays III and V. It should be remembered that the 'rewards' of which Jesus speaks are not material or external: they are the opportunity for fuller and more perfect exercise of the virtues which have won them. In such a hope there is nothing selfish or demoralising.

15–24. THE GUESTS WHO MADE EXCUSES

Matt. xxii. 1–14

The differences between the two versions of what is clearly the same parable are interesting. They are too great for a common written Greek source: they might perhaps be explained by two different translations of an Aramaic original, or more probably by two different versions current in different circles. There is not much doubt that Luke's version is the more original, though allegorically developed in some points: Matthew's version has been so developed to a greater extent.

15. Matthew places the parable on the 'Day of Questions' at Jerusalem, with a different introductory verse. In Luke's version this verse may be an editorial addition: but at any rate its connection with both the preceding and following verses is good. (*v.* 14) '...rewarded when the just shall rise again,' says Jesus. (*v.* 15) 'Ah! When the Kingdom comes, and we sit down at Messiah's feast, how happy we

16 bread in the kingdom of God. But he said unto him, A certain
17 man made a great supper; and he bade many: and he sent
forth his servant at supper time to say to them that were
18 bidden, Come; for *all* things are now ready. And they all
with one *consent* began to make excuse. The first said unto
him, I have bought a field, and I must needs go out and see

shall be,' exclaims one of the guests complacently. (*vv.* 16 f.) 'Don't count your chickens before they're hatched,' replies Jesus rather grimly in the parable that follows. 'Are you *quite* sure that you will be there?' Yet Matthew's *position* for the parable is better, when Jesus had finally broken with the Jewish leaders.

For the idea of the Messianic banquet cp. Isa. xxv. 6, 'And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined.'

16. In Matthew the host is a *king*, and the feast a *wedding-feast for his son*: 'the wedding-feast of the King's son is a Christian symbol of the joy of the union of Christ and His Church' (McNeile, *Matt. ad loc.*). Luke is thinking of the Messianic feast to which God has invited '*many*,' i.e. all the faithful among His people.

17. *his servant*: Matthew 'his servants.' Matthew may have substituted the plural to introduce a reference to the prophets: or, less probably, Luke the singular to refer to Christ, who summons the guests in his version. The story implies that the guests had been invited some time previously, and that they were again summoned when the feast was ready. This was a custom in classical times ('*vocatores*,' Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxv. 10; Suetonius, *Calig.* xxxix; Terence, *Hauton.* 169), and is said to persist in the East to-day.

Matthew says that after the first refusal the messengers were sent again, without success: this typifies the preaching of Jesus and the disciples.

18. The first and second excuses are flimsy enough: the purchases could wait. With regard to the third Plummer quotes Deut. xxiv. 5 in justification: 'When a man hath taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business; but he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken.' Yet they are all the kind of objection that could have been foreseen when the original invitation came—the sort of 'last-moment' excuse so common in similar circumstances in modern life. The three replies are in a descending scale of politeness.

Matthew's description of the excuses is much shorter: 'But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise.' He then adds: 'And the remnant took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them. But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city'—an allegorical reference to Jewish persecution of Christians and the fall of Jerusalem.

it: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have 19
bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray
thee have me excused. And another said, I have married a 20
wife, and therefore I cannot come. And the servant came, 21
and told his lord these things. Then the master of the house
being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the
streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor
and maimed and blind and lame. And the servant said, 22
Lord, what thou didst command is done, and yet there is
room. And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the 23
highways and hedges, and constrain *them* to come in, that
my house may be filled. For I say unto you, that none of 24
those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned, 25
and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me, and hateth 26
not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and

21–23. Luke has allegorised here. Matthew describes only one sending-out of the servants 'to the partings of the highways,' i.e. street corners in the city where the poor would loiter. Luke doubles this to describe a mission first to the poor within the city—i.e. the despised and rejected among the Jews themselves—then to the country lanes outside the city—i.e. to the Gentiles.

The point of the parable is, of course, the rejection of the Jewish religious leaders: cp. the two parables which precede this one in Matthew—the Two Sons, and the Husbandmen and the Heir (Matt. xxi. 28–46).

24. It seems clear, in view of *you*, that these words are not part of the parable, but addressed by Jesus to His fellow-guests to point the moral—added by Luke himself. The symbolism of the parable is kept up. Those originally invited to the Messianic banquet have lost their chance.

25–35. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

26–27. These two sayings (*v.* 25 is an editorial introduction) appear together in Matt. x. 37, 38 and may therefore be assigned to Q. The second also occurs in Mark viii. 34 (in a somewhat different form), where it is reproduced in Matt. xvi. 24 and Luke ix. 23. See the note on that verse.

Luke seems to present a contrast between the parable and the sayings that follow. The despised and outcast are bidden to the feast, but there is a price to be paid.

26. Matthew has 'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.' Luke's harsher version is no doubt more original. Matthew omits 'wife.'

brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot
27 be my disciple. Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and
28 come after me, cannot be my disciple. For which of you,
desiring to build a tower, doth not first sit down and count
29 the cost, whether he have *wherewith* to complete it? Lest
haply, when he hath laid a foundation, and is not able to
30 finish, all that behold begin to mock him, saying, This man
31 began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king, as
he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down
first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand
to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?
32 Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an
33 ambassage, and asketh conditions of peace. So therefore
whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath,

No one would understand this verse absolutely literally, as a justification for cruelty or suicide. Matthew's interpretation is right, if less primitive.

A passage from Rashdall's *Conscience and Christ* bears on this and similar passages. 'We must remember this fact, which is very essential for the understanding of Christ's teaching—that when Christ called men to "follow" Him, He did not mean merely that they should accept His teaching and endeavour to practise it in their lives. He was calling upon certain of His disciples to devote themselves to His great missionary enterprise, to join Him in going about the world to preach the coming of the Kingdom. It is to such men that the severer injunctions of the Gospel pages are addressed.... Many of these injunctions have, of course, an application to all who would be in our modern sense of the word followers of Christ, believers in His Gospel, members of His Church; but in their immediate and primary signification they were addressed to His Missionaries, not to all His hearers' (p. 150 f.). Rashdall notes that the present passage is addressed 'to the multitudes,' but refers to him who would be Christ's 'disciple.' 'To become a disciple of Christ in the strictest sense meant no doubt to join Him in His missionary work' (p. 151).

28–33. Counting the Cost. Peculiar to Luke. The two parables teach the same point—that it is foolish to undertake an important enterprise—such as discipleship—without serious thought. Cp. note on *v.* 33 below.

28. *a tower*: perhaps quite a simple affair, like the watchtower in a vineyard (Mark xii. 1): or perhaps a palace.

31. 'The question the king asks is by no means idle, for geographical conditions, better trained troops, etc. might justify him in fighting' (Easton, *ad loc.*).

33. If this verse is regarded as authentic, the remarks quoted at the end of the note on *v.* 26 above will apply to it also. Jesus' Missionaries 'must be as completely "detached" from worldly goods as from family

he cannot be my disciple. Salt therefore is good: but if even 34
the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned?
It is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill: *men* cast 35
it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

Now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto 15

ties' (Rashdall). But the verse may well be Luke's editorial conclusion to the passage—an emphatic reiteration of the principle of *v.* 26. For the verse does not sum up, as the *So therefore* claims to sum up, the point of the preceding parables. It may be true that Luke himself, as Easton says, 'would certainly have endorsed the doctrine that refusal to be baptized is better than apostasy': and in that case he would have understood the parables as implying that it is better not to attempt anything that one cannot be certain to accomplish—better 'never to be a disciple than to put down the cross after you have once taken it up.' But this cannot be what Jesus meant by the parables. He had too much sympathy for the weak strivings of human nature: and self-confidence such as Peter's when he said 'Though all shall be offended yet will not I'—'If I should die with Thee, I will not deny Thee' Jesus answered not with praise but with warning. He cannot then have meant to stress the necessity of complete confidence in the future. The thought is that in viii. 6, 7, 'some fell upon a rock; and... it withered away...And some fell among thorns; and the thorns... choked it': or in xi. 25 (the devil that came back)—how easy it is for impetuous enthusiasm to fall away. He urges His hearers to face, right from the beginning, the consequences of discipleship, and to steel their hearts to persevere.

34–35. Salt. Similar, with additions, to Matt. v. 13: this is the Q form. Cp. also Mark ix. 49–50—a different version. Streeter suggests that in Q the saying immediately followed *v.* 27 above (the two parables being inserted from L). 'In that connection,' he says, '"Salt is good, but if the salt has lost his savour..." would naturally mean "Disciples are good, but if they have lost the power to carry the cross, they cease to be a leaven to the lump of humanity"' (p. 236). Matthew puts it in the Sermon on the Mount, but the subject is the same—discipleship.

34. Commentators note (1) that pure salt never loses its saltness, (2) that in Palestine it was heavily taxed and therefore frequently adulterated.

35. It is no good for manure, even—the lowest use to which it might be put. 'The use of salt for manure is a well-attested practice for Egypt and Palestine, both in ancient and in modern times' (Creed).

XV. 1–7. THE LOST SHEEP

Cp. Matt. xviii. 12–14. Luke's version is independent of Matthew's; and the moral drawn from it quite different—in Matthew, 'So it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish,' in Luke, 'So there is joy in heaven over one repentant

2 him for to hear him. And both the Pharisees and the scribes
murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth
with them.

3,4 And he spake unto them this parable, saying, What man
of you, having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them,
doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go
5 after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath
6 found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when
he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and his
neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have
7 found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that even

sinner, rather than over ninety-nine righteous who need no repentance.' As in the case of the parable of the Great Supper (ch. xiv) and the Pounds (ch. xix) the differences are too great to permit the hypothesis of a common written source. For an interesting discussion of this point see Streeter, p. 234 f. He shews how reasonable it is to suppose that out of the parables in Matthew and Luke not derived from Mark or Q—11 in Matthew, 19 in Luke—there should be different versions of the same parable: while 'the supposition that they were derived from Q postulates too large an amount of editorial manipulation of that source.'

The first three verses are introductory to the whole chapter, which consists of three parables with the same moral—the recovery of the 'lost'—sheep, coin and son. They are reminiscent of v. 29–32—the scene in Levi's house.

2. *eateth with them.* This seems to be rather mechanically introduced from v. 30: though it might well be a frequent protest.

4. *until he find it?* A striking illustration of the *infinite* love of God. The shepherd's search has no limit; he does not stop looking when he has gone five miles or ten; he goes on till he finds the lost sheep however far from the fold it has strayed.

6. The small size of the flock, and the shepherd's simple joy in this verse, shew that Jesus is thinking of humble people, such as He would have known at His own home. Cp. note on the next parable.

7. This saying is a paradox and cannot be taken literally except by understanding 'righteous' to mean '*self*-righteous' such as the Pharisees—but this is artificial and weakens the force of the parable. What Jesus means is that just as the shepherd feels a natural joy over the recovery of one strayed sheep, which he does not feel for the ninety-nine who have not strayed, so there is joy in the heart of God when a sinner repents. It is not that the shepherd does not value the ninety-nine, but the recovery of the lost one excites in him a peculiar emotion. So it often is in family life: the tenderest spot in the mother's heart is for the prodigal who has strayed and returned. And so it is with the Father God, who cares infinitely for the saving of every human soul, however wicked.

so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, *more* than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance.

Or what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one 8
piece, doth not light alamp, and sweep the house, and seek diligently until she find it? And when she hath found it, she 9
calleth together her friends and neighbours, saying, Rejoice with me, for I have found the piece which I had lost. Even 10

Montefiore has an interesting section (No. 44) in his Introduction on *Parallel passages to the Gospels in Rabbinic literature* (Vol. I, p. cxxxviii f.). He stresses the point that what matters in such comparisons is not whether perhaps isolated parallels exist, but whether any particular saying is *characteristic* of Jesus or the Rabbis. 'To know this needs, doubtless, familiarity with the subject, but it needs also impartiality and a certain tact or *flair*.' He quotes the present verse and continues: 'It does not matter two pins whether you can produce an exact verbal parallel to this saying or not. And if you do produce it, its date is of no significance either. Those who have the *flair* I speak of even to a slight degree will immediately say: There is nothing original in this saying of Jesus at all. It is essentially Rabbinic. No Pharisaic or Rabbinic audience or Scribe would have turned a hair at it. Paradoxes of that kind about the sovereign glory of Repentance were quite familiar to them. Some Rabbis might perhaps have thought and smiled "That is rather stiff," but hardly more.' He goes on to contrast with this Mark vii. 15: 'There is nothing outside a man which entering into him can defile him; but it is the things which come out of a man that can defile him.' This he regards as 'entirely uncharacteristic' of Rabbinic teaching.

in heaven. This, as well as 'in the presence of the angels of God' in *v.* 10 below, is a periphrasis for God: i.e. 'God will rejoice.' For the Jewish custom of avoiding the use of the name of God see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 204 f.: or *HDCG*, art. 'Heaven.'

8–10. THE LOST COIN

Peculiar to Luke

Here again Jesus speaks out of His own experience of humble homes. Is it fanciful to imagine that He Himself had sometimes gone down on His hands and knees, as a boy, to help His mother look for the coin that had rolled off the table into some dark corner—a coin that mattered a great deal if they had only ten for the weekly budget?

8. *pieces of silver*. This is the only place where a '*drachma*' is mentioned in the N.T. It was equivalent in value to the '*denarius*' (see xii. 6 note). It is often mentioned in LXX: and as it was 'the unit of the Greek system of silver coinage, the name might be applied to a great variety of coins from different mints and of different standards' (*HDCG*, art. 'Money').

so, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

11, 12 And he said, A certain man had two sons: and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of *thy* substance that falleth to me. And he divided unto them
13 his living. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country; and
14 there he wasted his substance with riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country;
15 and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country; and he sent him into
16 his fields to feed swine. And he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto
17 him. But when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and
18 I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father,

11–32. THE PRODIGAL SON

Peculiar to Luke

This famous parable consists of two parts: *vv.* 11–24, the prodigal's return; and *vv.* 25–32, the elder son's protest. No one has ever questioned the originality of the first part: criticism of the second will be considered later. The story of the prodigal's return is the climax of the revelation of God's love for the sinner, which is offered by the three parables in this chapter. As Lagrange says (*Luc*, p. 240), a search for a sheep or a coin may to some degree owe its motive to self-interest. Joy at a prodigal's home-coming is its own guarantee of disinterestedness. In real life prodigals are more often encouraged to stay away. The New Testament presents no more perfect picture of God's character than this.

12. He wishes to seek his fortune abroad, and asks his father to give him in advance what would naturally fall to him at the father's death. From Ecclesiasticus xxxiii. 19–23 it appears that such action was not uncommon among Jewish fathers.

Apparently the elder son also receives his share at this time, although he stays at home. Yet later in the parable the elder son is still working for his father.

15. *to feed swine.* To a Jew no occupation could be more degrading than this—the pig being a forbidden animal.

16. *husks*, lit. 'carob-beans.' Lagrange says: 'When green they are so bitter as to hurt the mouth: but when dry they are sweeter, and are sold in the bazaars in Palestine. Animals are fed on them, and men nibble them' (*Luc*, p. 423). They are, to-day, one of the principal exports of Cyprus. It is said that they form one of the chief ingredients of inferior chocolates!

and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven,
and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son: 19
make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and 20
came to his father. But while he was yet afar off, his father
saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell
on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, 21
Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am
no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said 22
to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put
it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet:
and bring the fatted calf, *and* kill it, and let us eat, and make 23
merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was 24
lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. Now his 25

18. *against heaven*: i.e. 'against God.'

20. *kissed him.* The Greek is a strong word—'kissed him *tenderly*' (Plummer). 'As yet the son has said nothing, and the father does not know in what spirit he has returned; but it is enough that he *has* returned. The father has long been watching for this.'

21. Commentators give various reasons for the son's failing to finish the speech he had rehearsed. 'He is too ashamed to do more than just to confess his sin' (Montefiore); 'emotion prevents him' (Plummer); 'he is interrupted by his father's impetuosity' (Easton). The last is best. God's love meets the sinner half-way.

22. 'Hand without ring is as servile as feet without shoes' (Wellhausen). Only slaves went barefooted.

24. The words should be taken quite literally, not of moral 'death.' The son had been 'dead' to his home. The father's joy bursts forth into splendid words: 'My son here'—(with his arm round him?)—'was dead and is risen, was lost and is found.' Such is the joy in the heart of God when the wanderer comes home.

25–32. Some commentators treat these verses as an allegorical addition to the parable. There is, moreover, some inconsistency between *v.* 12 and *v.* 29. Whether they are to be allegorically interpreted or not (see below), the best argument for the unity of the parable is Loisy's, in his earlier work, that if these verses are not original it is hard to see why the elder brother is introduced at all (*Év. Syn.* II, p. 153). In his later work, however, he regards the passage as an addition (*Luc*, p. 402). The average reader will probably feel that the verses are something of an anti-climax, but that they deal with a very pertinent difficulty—the kind of problem presented by such words as those in *v.* 7 above (see note there), 'Greater joy . . . over one sinner that repents, than over ninety and nine just persons.' There seems to be no reason why Jesus should not have felt this, and thus completed the parable by a defence of God's mercy.

Moreover, as Easton points out, allegorical interpretation is difficult: '*v.* 31 quite excludes taking the eldest son as a Pharisee. . . . And *v.* 29

elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to
26 the house, he heard music and dancing. And he called to him
one of the servants, and inquired what these things might be.
27 And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father
hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe
28 and sound. But he was angry, and would not go in: and his
29 father came out, and intreated him. But he answered and
said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and
I never transgressed a commandment of thine: and *yet* thou
never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my

tells equally against finding a contrast between Jewish and Gentile Christianity... for no Jewish Christian would complain that God had never done anything for Israel' (*ad loc.*). The lesson which Jesus is concerned to emphasise is that those who have not sinned themselves are wrong if they feel injured when the sinner who repents is joyfully received. God's mercy shewn to the sinner does not lessen their own share. To the Pharisees, in their lack of sympathy towards the religious outcasts who repented at Jesus' preaching, the verses would doubtless have a specially pointed application. But their original reference is wider than that. There must be no self-righteous and grudging jealousy in the family of the sons of God. One is reminded of a splendid phrase in one of R. L. Stevenson's prayers: 'Purge from every heart the lurking grudge.'

25. The thought will perhaps occur, 'Could not the elder son have been told of what had happened, and summoned to share the festivities?' Perhaps it is unwise to ask a parable such a question—or the neglect might be due to pure accident and excitement: but if it is felt as a defect in the father's character, it may be well to point out that the father's character is not itself a picture of the character of God. Parables are not allegories: and the characters in them must not be regarded as typical in all their details. Certain aspects of their actions illustrate certain aspects of the character to whose actions comparison is implied—the father's action in welcoming the prodigal illustrates God's mercy and love. This point will need even clearer emphasis in two other parables—the 'Unrighteous' Steward, and Judge. Cp. xi. 8, note.

28. As Lagrange says, at this stage the elder brother's attitude is partially excused by his ignorance. He does not know of his brother's repentance or of his miserable plight. The father realises this and comes to explain.

29. The elder brother is not a hypocrite: he has always done his duty by his father, and it looks as if the father has taken him rather too much for granted—in some English homes there is a daughter in the same position. But his fault is hardness and lack of imagination, even if his complaint is logically just. (This verse is not easy to reconcile with *v.* 12.)

friends: but when this thy son came, which hath devoured 30
thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf.
And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all 31
that is mine is thine. But it was meet to make merry and 32
be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive *again*;
and *was* lost, and is found.

30. *this thy son*: contemptuous, 'this son of yours.'

31–32. The father answers him gently, even apologetically. 'You could have had what you liked of mine, my son, if you had asked for it: I know how well you have served me. But don't you see that it could not possibly have been right not to make merry when the boy we had lost came home?'

Difficulty is sometimes felt with regard to the *justice* of this parable. Something has already been said in the notes with regard to this, but it may be well to add that bare justice, interpreted as to give no man more than his due, is not such a virtue—if it be a virtue at all—as Jesus would have recommended to His disciples. 'Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.' That God should 'go the second mile' with a sinner is not a defect in His justice, but the most precious jewel in His crown of love. Where the greater love is needed, there it is given without stint. The mother loves the black sheep most because he needs her love most. The others need not go short.

Creed has an interesting note on the parable's teaching with regard to forgiveness. 'It is noteworthy that the repentant prodigal is at once received back to his father's love. Repentance on the son's part calls forth of itself the father's forgiveness. Nothing suggests that a mediator is needed between the erring son and his father. It is urged by some critics that here we have the original Gospel teaching on repentance and forgiveness—a teaching which has been later overlaid by the Church's doctrine of remission of sins in virtue of Christ's death upon the cross.... Luke appears nowhere to associate the remission of sins directly with Christ's death' (p. 197).

XVI. 1–8. THE CLEVER STEWARD

Peculiar to Luke

Christianity has suffered no small loss from misunderstandings of this notoriously difficult parable. The difficulty mainly turns on the meaning of 'the lord' (there is no 'his' in the Greek) in *v.* 8, and the fact that the steward's selfishly motived cunning is commended. (1) If *v.* 8 is, as is usually held, part of the parable—so Luke himself thought—'the lord' will mean 'the steward's master,' who is himself a man of low principles; though dismissing him, he admires the cleverness with which the steward has provided for his future. On this view further difficulty is often felt with regard to the master's character, which is regarded as a type of the character of God. As has been shewn

16 And he said also unto the disciples, There was a certain
rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused
2 unto him that he was wasting his goods. And he called him,
and said unto him, What is this that I hear of thee? render
the account of thy stewardship; for thou canst be no longer
3 steward. And the steward said within himself, What shall
I do, seeing that my lord taketh away the stewardship from
4 me? I have not strength to dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am
resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the steward-
5 ship, they may receive me into their houses. And calling to

in the notes on xi. 8 and xv. 25, such an allegorising treatment of a parable is not justifiable, and the difficulty is therefore quite unfounded. The steward's forethought in providing for his material well-being is, *according to its lights*, praiseworthy: and Jesus uses it to recommend to His disciples a similar forethought in spiritual things. But this does not mean that the steward's action is, *according to the Christian moral standard*, in itself good. Cp. 'The Unjust Judge' in chapter xviii. (2) Some modern commentators suggest that in the original source which Luke is using, the parable (or, as J. Weiss suggested, the narrative of an actual event) ended at *v.* 7, and that *v.* 8 is Jesus' comment upon it. In that case 'the lord' means Jesus, but the point remains much the same. 'The ingenuity of the steward's device is really unusual—if only the children of light would expend as much ingenuity for more praiseworthy ends!' (Easton). This is attractive, for it avoids the necessity of supposing so much about the 'master,' who, on this view, does not appear at all after *v.* 2. As has been shewn above, it need occasion no surprise that Jesus should commend to the attention of His disciples (perhaps with a smile?) the action of a man of low principles.

1. *a steward.* 'Here he is a superior person to the one mentioned in xii. 42. There the steward is a slave or freedman, left in charge of other slaves, corresponding on the whole to the Roman *dispensator* or *villicus*. Here he is a freeman, having the entire management of the estate, a *procurator*' (Plummer, *ad loc.*). 'Agent' is the best English word.

3. *I have not strength to dig*, i.e. 'to earn my living as a labourer.'

4. *they may receive*: that the subject of this should have to be supplied from what follows—i.e. the grateful debtors—is an inconsequent anticipation common in colloquial speech, and especially perhaps in the unfolding of a plan.

5–7. It is not possible to determine exactly who the *debtors* are. Either tenants who paid their rent in kind, a certain proportion of the produce of their farms: or people who had bought goods on credit. The latter seems more probable in view of the fact that such debts would be far more difficult for the master to check than payment of rent, and that the 'bills' appear to be simple promises to pay.

him each one of his lord's debtors, he said to the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, A hundred 6
measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bond, and sit down quickly and write fifty. Then said he to another, 7
And how much owest thou? And he said, A hundred measures of wheat. He saith unto him, Take thy bond, and write fourscore. And his lord commended the unrighteous steward 8
because he had done wisely: for the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light.

5. *How much owest thou...?* 'The questions are asked simply for the information of the reader' (Easton). The steward had the IOU's himself.

6. The 'bonds' would, of course, be in the debtor's own handwriting: probably he writes a new copy with the altered amount, not simply alters the old one.

8. See note at beginning of section. If 'the lord' is the master, it must be supposed that he discovered the steward's conduct, but was either unable, or too easy-going, to take any action—at least the story does not hint at any action.

for the sons etc. This is the moral of the parable whether 'the lord' is the master or Jesus. But the word 'for' will be differently understood. If 'the lord' is Jesus, it will have its natural sense. If 'the lord' is the master, 'for' is more difficult, because the words following it must obviously be attributed to Jesus, not the master. Commentators supply some such words as 'He was justified in praising his cleverness, for...' or 'I tell you this parable, for it shews how....' But this is not very satisfactory, and the difficulty is another argument for thinking that the parable originally ended at *v.* 7.

the sons of this world...the sons of the light. The Hebrew idiom 'sons of' means 'those who share the characteristics of.' 'This world' is the present and evil age as opposed to the 'age to come,' when the Messiah should have appeared. For 'sons of light' cp. John xii. 36: 'While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.' Thus the phrases here mean 'worldly people'...'those who share the light that comes from God,' 'spiritually-minded people.' Jesus' meaning is that worldly men are inclined to shew more energy and forethought in the pursuit of their aims than spiritually enlightened men in theirs: though, as Easton points out, 'absolutely speaking, it is the latter who are "wise," for they seek the goods of the highest order.'

for their own generation. This may be taken in two ways: (1) 'Towards people of the same outlook as themselves,' i.e. 'in their dealings with other worldly people.' So Lagrange, Loisy, Plummer: but there does not seem much point, for worldly people are not less but more worldly when dealing with people of higher principles. (2) 'As far as this life is concerned.' Easton interprets this by the sentence quoted at the end of the last note above. But one is inclined to agree with him when

9 And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means
of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail,
10 they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles. He that

he adds later, 'the words...are doubtless an addition of Luke's, introduced in anxious fear lest Christ's praise of the steward's knavery be misconstrued. Hence the confusion' (p. 244).

9–13. THE USE OF WEALTH

9–12 peculiar to Luke: 13 = Matt. vi. 24

9. It is doubtful whether this verse was originally connected with the parable. Its general sense does not suit the parable, which does not urge the wise use of money but the general duty of forethought. Luke may have used it here to point what he felt to be the moral of the parable because of the similarity of its ending to that of *v.* 4.

The saying is variously interpreted according to the meaning given to *mammon of unrighteousness*. 'Mammon' is an Aramaic word meaning 'entrusted, stored up,' i.e. 'money.' The genitive 'of unrighteousness' may be taken in a general sense, in which case the whole phrase means 'money, which is so often a source of evil'—'which always has a taint about it' (Montefiore): or, with a narrower application of the genitive, 'money wrongfully acquired,' 'ill-gotten gains.' The meaning of the whole verse will therefore be either (1) 'Wealth, though frequently a source of sin, can yet be used in such a way as to secure something much more valuable and more lasting than itself.' The 'something' so secured is vague—the friendship and gratitude of the poor, or the happiness or goodness of generosity, regarded as obtaining God's approval. Or (2) 'If you have obtained money wrongfully, you can, nevertheless, use it in such a way that it may serve you in good stead,' i.e. by almsgiving (Montefiore). In this case Jesus may be supposed to have been speaking to the 'publicans' of xv. 1.

when it shall fail; 'when mammon ceases to be of any value,' i.e. when a man dies.

The subject of *may receive* may be the 'angels,' i.e. God: or it may be impersonal and equivalent to a passive, 'you may be received.' In any case God is meant.

Some valuable notes on the question of Jesus' teaching about future reward—the morality of which is sometimes challenged—will be found in Rashdall's *Conscience and Christ*, p. 290 f., from which the following extracts are taken:

'Christ did appreciate and teach the intrinsic value of goodness and the intrinsic evil of sin....The idea that goodness is to be valued solely on account of its posthumous reward is inconsistent with the whole tone of His teaching both about God and about human duty. He distinctly makes the love of God the supreme and ideal motive for goodness. You cannot love from hope of reward or fear of punishment. ...But it is quite undeniable that He did also seek to encourage men to do right and to resist temptation by the thought of a future life

is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much.
If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous 11
mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches*?
And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, 12
who will give you that which is your own? No servant can 13

the character of which would depend upon the use they made of their wills in this life.... There is nothing demoralising in such teaching if it is not made the *sole* or the *chief* motive for virtue, and this most certainly our Lord never did.... The hope of future blessedness has ethical value (1) educationally, as leading up to and preparing men for a more disinterested goodness; (2) as affording help and encouragement to those who are indeed hungering and thirsting after righteousness, but are as yet far from being perfected Christians...; (3) in so far as the reward is thought of as itself consisting in a state of greater moral perfection or as a happiness which is the natural and necessary consequence of goodness, the doctrine of reward and punishment begins to assume a form in which it is not only consistent with the belief in the intrinsic value of goodness, but becomes hard to distinguish from it....'

10–13. Luke has probably put these verses here in order to guard against any misunderstanding of the parable above. Although the steward's cleverness is commended, dishonesty in money matters is none the less to be condemned.

11. *in the unrighteous mammon.* Cp. *v.* 9 note above. The only interpretation possible here is the first there given, 'money, which is so often a source of evil.' This would seem to favour the first interpretation in *v.* 9 were it not that the adjective here may be derived from the phrase in that verse.

the true riches, i.e. the privileges of the Kingdom of God, spiritual blessings.

12. *in that which is another's.* Possibly this was originally meant quite literally, with a reference to the steward of the parable. 'If a man is not honest with what belongs to someone else, he will not acquire possessions of his own.' But as Luke has arranged it we must accept the symbolism, and understand it to mean 'what really belongs to God': i.e. money is only a trust lent to man by God. 'If a man is not honest in that trust, God will certainly not give him the spiritual blessings that are permanently his own.'

your own: some MSS read 'our own.' It is true that '"your own" would be an inevitable correction, if "our own" were genuine' (Plummer). With 'our own' the phrase would mean either 'that which belongs to the Messiah and to the other citizens of the Kingdom' (B. Weiss), or 'that which belongs to God and Me.' The first sense is possible on Jesus' lips, but not natural to the context: the second belongs to the Christ of later Christian interpretation, not to the Jesus of history. If the reading is not genuine, it was no doubt meant to be interpreted in this way: and its introduction would be due to the

serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

14 And the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all
15 these things; and they scoffed at him. And he said unto them, Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of

desire to guard against ideas of human self-sufficiency by emphasising the fact that spiritual blessings came not from men themselves but from Christ and God.

13. The word *serve* must be given its full force 'to be the slave of.' God and riches cannot *both* be the most important objects on a man's horizon. Jesus never says in so many words that a man cannot be rich and yet serve God: He only says that if a man's main object in life is the acquiring of wealth, his main object cannot at the same time be the fulfilment of God's will. But one can at the same time admit the truth of Rashdall's guarded remark on Jesus' teaching about the possession of property: 'Here for once the anticipation of the immediate Parousia'—('Second Coming')—'may be allowed to have influenced the specific advice given by Jesus to His hearers' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 151); or of Montefiore's words: 'Jesus had an acute sense of the moral dangers of wealth and of the sins to which wealth or the love of money may give rise. As Pfleiderer points out, He agreed with most ancient thinkers in supposing riches to be not a means for productive moral action, but a mere source of pleasure and enjoyment. With many other pious Jews of His age He saw in the rich, as a social class, the oppressors of the poor, the children of "this world," the enemies of the divine Kingdom' (*Syn. Gosp.* II, p. 109).

14–18. SAYINGS TO THE PHARISEES

14–15. Luke only. These two verses are Luke's introduction to the parable of Dives and Lazarus, of which *v.* 15 points the moral.

14. *who were lovers of money.* It is hard to escape the conclusion that these words owe their introduction here more to a desire to relate the 'scoffing' of the Pharisees to the preceding verses than to any accurate knowledge of the Pharisees' characteristics on the part of the writer. Jewish comment may be represented by Montefiore: 'The charge, so far as we know, lacks historical foundation. It is only one more of the attacks by which the Evangelists seek to blacken their Jewish opponents' (*ad loc.*). How far Christian scholarship is coming to recognise that such sweeping condemnations of the Pharisees are not justified by the facts may be seen from the contrast between Plummer (1896): 'Avarice was their constant characteristic....The covetousness of the Pharisees is independently attested'; and Easton (1926): 'This designation produces a situation that is historically false,—whatever may have been the sins of the Pharisees, failure to emphasise the importance of alms-giving was not one of them.'

15. The verse serves as an introduction to the parable in *v.* 19 f.

men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted
among men is an abomination in the sight of God. The law 16
and the prophets *were* until John: from that time the gospel
of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth

The rich man is 'exalted' to human eyes, but 'an abomination' to God, and Lazarus *vice versa*.

16–18. These verses are very difficult in themselves, and one can only guess why Luke put them here. Streeter says of them: 'The three sayings are perhaps from Q. Q, so far as one can make out, was a collection of the "Wise Sayings" of Christ, comparable to a book like Proverbs...with very little attempt at arrangement. And what we have in this passage of Luke is three separate aphorisms...the only connection between which is that they are epigrammatic rulings on disputed points connected with the Law' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 286). Perhaps the least unsatisfactory explanation of the position of the verses here is that *v.* 16 seemed to Luke to be illustrated by *vv.* 29–31 below (about Moses and the prophets), and that he then preferred to insert all three verses.

16. Matthew has (xi. 12) 'And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force.' This is probably more original than Luke's version, of which, as Streeter says, *the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached* appears to be 'an attempt to explain an extremely obscure saying.' The obscurity of the saying has led to the widest divergence in interpretation. This is seen in the following quotation from the eschatologist Warschauer's *Historical Life of Christ* (1927): 'This, in accordance with the conventional conception of our Saviour as a calm, serene sage, has been taken as a rebuke to those ardent spirits who would not wait, but meant to realise their aspirations by a supreme effort: in truth, it expressed the very opposite of a rebuke, which the words do not so much as imply, and it would be truer to say that even if Jesus did not approve of all the methods of these men, He sympathised warmly with their zealous, activist disposition. The Kingdom of God was to be forced on, pressure was to be brought to bear which would compass the great end—and this process had been going on since the days of John the Baptist, i.e. for the last year or two. That process consisted in a passionate return to God....Repentance...was to compel the Kingdom to appear, and that speedily' (p. 84 f.). To Warschauer this saying is one of the chief foundations of his interpretation of Jesus: he sees in it 'the point where Jesus' ethical enthusiasm coalesces with, and transforms, His eschatological hopes; He preaches the nearness of the Kingdom, but preaches it as a consummation to be reached by a resolute moral regeneration, a vehement passionate willingness to surrender all, sacrifice all, and so to achieve that worthiness of the Kingdom upon which the Kingdom itself would follow....Only "by force"...is the Kingdom to be taken' (p. 85).

The opposite view, implied in the first quotation above, regards the saying as a protest against the idea of the Kingdom as political and

17 violently into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass
18 away, than for one tittle of the law to fall. Every one that

military, to be established by force. Jesus says (according to Matthew's version): 'Ever since I began My work the Kingdom has been treated as something to be obtained by violent means, and men whose weapons are the weapons of force'—the Zealots, for instance—'try to establish it by force.' This is attractive, for Jesus was never free from the difficulties of the cruder and more materialistic Messianic conceptions of the Jewish populace. The thought is akin to that in the third Temptation (Luke iv. 5 note).

A third view, which suits Luke's version better than Matthew's, and is presumably Luke's own interpretation of the verse, is that it expresses the eagerness with which men greet the proclamation of the Kingdom. 'Ever since John began his work enthusiastic people have rushed into the Kingdom—eager but unorthodox people like "publicans and sinners"'; or perhaps 'including many who are not worthy of it.' The objection to this is that, as Loisy says, 'the exaggeration is high, even on the part of the most determined optimists.' But it is not impossible that there was a time, early in Jesus' ministry, when it was true.

17. Matt. v. 18. *tittle*, lit. 'a little horn,' i.e. (usually) a small stroke the addition of which distinguishes one letter of the Hebrew alphabet from another otherwise the same. But Cadbury (*Making of Luke-Acts*), following Strack-Billerbeck, says: 'Not merely the smallest letter...nor even a distinguishing part of a letter, but the "horns, thorns and crowns" as the Rabbis called them, which were purely decorative apexes drawn above certain letters in scrolls of the sacred Torah' (p. 148).

This verse also has met with very varied treatment by the commentators. In Matthew it occurs in the middle of a passage in which, as Allens say, 'Christ is represented as speaking in the spirit of Alexandrine and Rabbinical Judaism' (*Matt.* p. 45). Its position in Matthew is therefore due to Matthew himself, as it must have stood in Q. As has been said above, it seems to have little real connection with *vv.* 16 and 18 here, and there is therefore no clue to its original context.

Easton says: 'The authenticity of this saying should never have been called in question. Christ was hostile to the scribal tradition but His attitude towards the Old Testament itself was one of unquestioning acceptance; to Him this was God's word, without qualification. The words of the Law put an end to all controversy. And the words of the Law, if rightly understood, were the sure guide to salvation' (*ad loc.*). No doubt Jesus' antagonism to the Law has been greatly exaggerated: but it is hard to believe that He would have spoken such words as these, so liable to disastrous misunderstanding, without further qualification. Yet, as Creed says, 'it is at any rate certain that it must have been plausible for many of the early believers to suppose that He had done so, and that is highly significant. Jesus criticised the Law

putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery.

at particular points, but the question of the validity of the Law as a whole did not arise before the Gentile Mission' (p. 207).

Luke himself would not have inserted the verse if he had thought it Judaistic. Presumably he understood it as meaning that the Law was absolutely and completely fulfilled in, and therefore superseded by, Jesus.

18. This verse is parallel to Matt. v. 32: and Matt. xix. 1–9 = Mark x. 1–12 should be compared. Luke agrees with Mark in recording the prohibition of divorce without any exception (Matthew has 'saving for the cause of fornication' in v. 32, and 'except for fornication' in xix. 9).

It does not seem within the scope of a commentary on Luke, whose sole reference to the subject is this verse, to discuss at any length the complicated problem of Jesus' teaching about divorce. Such discussions will be found in all commentaries on Mark and Matthew at the passages quoted above. Particularly honest and valuable are Montefiore's remarks (*Syn. Gospels*, I, p. 225 f.; II, p. 65 f. and p. 257 f.). The arguments on both sides of the question will be clearly seen in Dr R. H. Charles' *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*: and *Divorce in the New Testament* (a reply to Dr Charles) by Dr Box and Dr Gore. (These are both small books, published in 1921.)

As one reads the discussion, which centres round the question, 'Did Jesus *absolutely* prohibit divorce, or did He allow it in cases of unfaithfulness?,' one cannot help feeling that the point at issue is not such as can be definitely settled on the evidence available; and that the controversy has reached a stage at which the views of the protagonists on either side are inevitably due, not so much to their conclusions on the literary evidence, as to their traditional or modernist tendencies of thought, and their views on ecclesiastical practice. In these circumstances Dr Rashdall's words are helpful: 'The difficulty which we experience in determining what our Lord actually taught on this matter impressively illustrates the absolute impossibility of basing detailed rules for the guidance of modern life upon isolated sayings of Christ. That the ideal is permanent monogamous marriage, is undoubtedly the principle which Jesus taught; and that ideal still appeals to all the higher ethical feeling of our time. By what detailed enactments the ideal may be best promoted, which is the less of two evils when the ideal has been violated and made impossible, is a question which must be settled by the moral consciousness, the experience, the practical judgement of the present. That principle has been freely adopted by the Christian Church in other cases. Our Lord's prohibition of divorce, even if the exception is removed, is not more peremptory, as far as the letter goes, than the prohibition of oaths, of self-defence, or of going to law' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 106).

'In His teaching about marriage, as about other matters, Christ is seen, not as the good Legislator, but as the great Liberator of men

19 Now there was a certain rich man, and he was clothed in
20 purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day: and a
certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate, full of
21 sores, and desiring to be fed with the *crumbs* that fell from
the rich man's table; yea, even the dogs came and licked his
22 sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and that
he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom:
23 and the rich man also died, and was buried. And in Hades

from legalism...Jesus stood for equity, not legality: and He put obedience to moral and spiritual principles in the place of obedience to legal codes....It follows, therefore, that to appeal to Christ's enunciation of moral and spiritual ideals as if they were legal enactments is to misuse them' (H. D. A. Major, *Modern Churchman*, Aug. 1930, p. 335).

19–31. DIVES AND LAZARUS

Luke only

As has been pointed out above, the connection of this story is really with *v.* 15, the reversal of human judgement by the judgement of God.

20. *Lazarus.* The name is equivalent to the Hebrew 'Eliezer,' and means 'helped by God.' Verses 30 and 31 below suggest that there is some connection between this story and the raising of Lazarus in John xi. Possibly 'the story of the raising of Lazarus was already in circulation at the time of the composition of the Gospel, and the conclusion of the parable may have been composed and added, and the name Lazarus incorporated, under the influence of that story' (Creed). Perhaps, on the other hand, the tradition in John xi owes the name to this parable.

21. Commentators suggest that owing to the cruelty and stinginess of the rich man Lazarus did not get any scraps and was always hungry. But as Grieve says (*Peake's Commentary*), 'We need not suppose that Dives was specially cruel: if Lazarus had only got harsh treatment at his door, he would have shifted his pitch.'

There seems little foundation for the popular idea that even the dogs took pity on him in his misery, and did their best to heal his wounds. The point is rather that Lazarus was not strong enough to drive the carrion dogs away from him, and so suffered what to a Jew would seem the last indignity, the pollution of their touch.

22–23. The story's references to the next world do not go beyond the popular Jewish conceptions on the subject, which seem to have varied very considerably. Thus some commentators suppose that the idea here is of Sheol as an intermediate state in which there are two compartments, one ('Abraham's bosom') reserved for the good, the other for the evil. Another view is represented by Montefiore: 'The Greek word Hades in this verse (23) is equivalent to hell or Gehenna. Abraham is in heaven or Paradise, and close by him is Lazarus.... The story follows the second main strand of popular belief in the

he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham
afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, 24
Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that
he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue;
for I am in anguish in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, 25
remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good
things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things: but now here
he is comforted, and thou art in anguish. And beside all this, 26
between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they
which would pass from hence to you may not be able, and

hereafter. Instead of waiting, all alike, in Hades or Sheol, till the Resurrection and the last Judgement, the good and bad are judged at once. Straightway after death the good go to heaven, the bad to hell' (*Syn. Gospels*, II, p. 538).

23. *being in torments.* Why is he tortured? For his riches, or his sins? See note at end.

24. The picture of hell is conventional, duly supplied with flames. Probably the rich man asks that Lazarus may come to him because Lazarus is the only other character on the stage, so to speak: possibly, however, there is the further point that he who had hardly given Lazarus a thought in his lifetime is now compelled by his sufferings to seek his aid.

25. 'Abraham is made to speak as if to every man there were allotted fixed amounts of good and evil; if uncompleted in this world, they must be exhausted hereafter' (Easton). For the moral ideas involved see note at end.

26. Montefiore says: 'There is no passing from hell to heaven. He who is once in hell will always remain there. A truly horrible doctrine: yet there is no reason to believe that Jesus, like other good men of his age, did not hold it' (*Syn. Gospels*, II, p. 539). The doctrine is certainly horrible enough, but Dr Montefiore's next words are open to question. It is at least doubtful whether the parable is describing a permanent or an intermediate abode (see note on *v.* 22 above); there is no sign that the parable represents Jesus' own thought, especially if it was founded on a current legend (see note at end); and, as Dr Charles says: 'Though in conformity with Jewish tradition punishment is generally conceived as everlasting in the Gospels, yet there are not wanting passages which appear to fix a finite and limited punishment for certain offenders, and hence recognise the possibility of moral change in the intermediate state. Thus some are to be beaten with few, others with many, stripes (Luke xii. 47). It is not possible to conceive eternal torment under the figure of a few stripes.... It may not be amiss likewise to find signs of this moral amelioration in the rich man in Hades who appeals to Abraham on behalf of his five brethren still on earth. And if we appeal to the science of ethics which finds its perfect realisation in Christianity, the idea that forgiveness is impossible in the next life has only to be stated in order to be rejected; for till

27 that none may cross over from thence to us. And he said,
I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him
28 to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may
testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of
29 torment. But Abraham saith, They have Moses and the

absolute fixity of character is reached, repentance and forgiveness, being moral acts, must be possible under a perfectly moral Being' (*Eschatology*, p. 399).

27–31. These verses are variously regarded: (1) As an integral part of the parable, which is based on the saying 'You cannot serve God and mammon.' The rich man has served mammon and been punished. Is this some new moral law? No, it is that of the prophets and Moses. No wonder the Pharisees 'scoff' at Jesus' teaching (*v.* 14): they do not even understand that of Moses. (So Lagrange.) (2) As an allegorising addition condemning the unbelief of the Jews, added after the Resurrection. The Jews could not be converted because they could not recognise Christ in the Scriptures. (So Loisy.) The 'five brothers' Loisy regards as the five books of the Mosaic Law, others (with the rich man) as the unbelieving half of the Jewish nation ($6 = \frac{1}{2}$ of 12). (3) As simply teaching that men must seek salvation through obedience to the moral law, and must not expect or wait for miraculous 'signs' to convince them. In an essay published in 1918 H. Gressmann gave parallels to the first part of the parable from Jewish and Egyptian literature, and urged that Jesus based this parable on a story of this kind, originally coming from Egypt and well known in Palestine at the time. 'But Christ disapproved of stories of visits to the other world as ministering to idle curiosity (or worse); consequently He Himself added the appendix, stating the uselessness of such accounts and directing all attention to the observance of the moral Law, something that (as Gressmann most justly states) is entirely in accord with His teaching elsewhere' (Easton, p. 254).

What is the parable intended to teach? Is its 'morality' satisfactory? The crucial point is the apparent 'doctrine of equivalence' in *v.* 25. Is the rich man wicked as well as rich, and punished for his wickedness: or is he punished simply because of his wealth? Montefiore takes the former view: 'The point of view is the same as we have already met with in some of the special material of Luke. The rich are the oppressors; the poor are the oppressed' (cp. the 'Woes' in vi. 24 f.). 'Neither "deserve" their present lot: in the world to come this lot will be changed' (p. 537). Stanton (with other more conservative critics) emphatically denies this: 'The parable does not say this...; is there any reason for holding that it is implied? Surely the selfish absorption of the rich man in his own pleasure and his indifference to misery that lay so near at hand, could not be more vividly pourtrayed; and what sins could be more heinous? For these he is condemned.... No doubt if the parable had been addressed to a congregation of beggars, there were warnings suited to their own case which should have been added: but for the rich and for the multitudes of ordinary

prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abra- 30
ham: but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent.
And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, 31
neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead.

And he said unto his disciples, It is impossible but that 17
occasions of stumbling should come: but woe unto him,
through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone 2
were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the
sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones

men who, though not rich, were striving to be so...it contained nothing but salutary instruction' (*Gosp. as Hist. Doc.* II, p. 235).

The truth may lie between these two extremes. The parable seems far too vague and conventional to be used as a ground for the attribution to Jesus of any hard and fast doctrine of reversal of wealth and poverty in the next life, irrespective of morality: and this is especially the case if the parable is based on a current legend. Moreover, would not Jesus in any case have condemned the rich man for his lack of imagination—for taking the beggar for granted, so to speak, each time he drove out of his gate, and doing nothing about him? But it is wise at the same time to remember that Jesus' views on riches were no doubt in some measure limited by the circumstances of His day—and that with Luke himself this may have been the case to a considerably greater degree (cp. note on *v.* 13 above).

Some interesting remarks on the subject will be found in a clear and helpful little book, *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, by Professor E. F. Scott (Macmillan, 1924), p. 51 f. and p. 89 f. Of this parable Professor Scott says: 'Luke was plainly a man of tender and generous sentiment who in his warm sympathy for the poor had come to idealise poverty. It need not be doubted that the sayings which he attributes to Jesus are genuine; but he is at pains to put this side of the teaching into the forefront, and gives it at times a wrong emphasis. That he does so in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus can hardly be questioned. The original meaning of the parable may have been little more than that earthly positions will be reversed in the coming age. But the rich man's fate is so presented that he seems to be punished simply because he is rich, while Lazarus is rewarded for his poverty. This false and puerile lesson cannot be that which Jesus intended' (p. 91).

XVII. 1–10. FOUR SAYINGS

They have no connection either with what precedes them, or with each other.

1–2. Stumbling-blocks. Cp. Mark ix. 42 (parallel to Luke's *v.* 2 only), and Matt. xviii. 6–7 (in the reverse order). Presumably this saying stood both in Mark and Q (with the addition of *v.* 1): Luke's is the Q version.

2. *these little ones.* In Matthew the context refers to children. In

3 to stumble. Take heed to yourselves: if thy brother sin,
4 rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin
against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn
again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.
5 And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith.
6 And the Lord said, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard
seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted
up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed
7 you. But who is there of you, having a servant plowing or
keeping sheep, that will say unto him, when he is come in
8 from the field, Come straightway and sit down to meat; and

Mark the words 'that believe on me' are added (which Matthew does not omit, though they do not suit his context), and, as in Luke, the context demands a figurative meaning, 'simple, humble believers.' Probably the saying originally urged reverence for the innocence of childhood, and condemned the sin of leading them astray. The sternness of the condemnation is striking: men's consciences have always felt the same.

3–4. Forgiveness. *Take heed to yourselves.* These words can go either with what precedes or what follows. They form a vague connecting link.

In Matthew (xviii. 15–22) a much longer version of this saying is given, developed along 'ecclesiastical' lines. There can be no doubt whatever that Luke gives the original form. Streeter (p. 282) gives another version from the 'Gospel of the Hebrews,' which is more like Matthew than Luke, and shews the process of development at an earlier stage.

4. *seven times in the day*: for the Jewish use of the number seven as an unlimited number, see *HDCG*, art. 'Numbers.' Jesus means 'over and over again.'

5–6. Faith. Matt. xvii. 19–20 (cp. Mark xi. 22–23 = Matt. xxi. 21). Similar sayings stood in Mark and Q. Luke gives here the Q version. Matthew has combined Mark and Q in the earlier passage and gives the Mark version itself later. (Streeter, p. 284.) Luke speaks of a tree: Matthew and Mark of a mountain. If the tree was originally in Q, Matthew may have substituted the mountain from Mark: but Luke may have substituted tree for mountain in the Q version because the similar saying in Mark occurs in connection with the withered fig-tree. This is supported by the fact that both Luke and Mark have the words 'in the sea,' which are quite inappropriate to a tree.

6. *as a grain of mustard seed*: the point is its small size. 'A very little real faith goes a surprisingly long way,' says Jesus.

sycamine. There is some doubt whether the tree meant here is a mulberry tree (the usual meaning of the word) or a sycomore, which is however different from the English sycamore. Cp. xix. 4 note.

7–10. Duty. Peculiar to Luke.

7–8. Jesus does not either commend or condemn the attitude He

will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he 9 thank the servant because he did the things that were commanded? Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the 10 things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do.

And it came to pass, as they were on the way to Jerusalem, 11

describes. He simply assumes the usual attitude of masters to servants. The household described is not a wealthy one, for the same single servant does both the inside and outside work.

10. The fact that Jesus here illustrates God's relation to man by that of a master to his servants (or slaves) need not seem contradictory because He so frequently elsewhere describes it as that of Father to children. The details of the parable must not be allegorised so far as to assume that *v.* 9 is a description of God's attitude to men, or His feelings towards a faithful disciple. The point here is what men should feel towards God. As Montefiore says, 'We have responsibility and duties, but no right to, or claim upon, reward. Whatever good a man does he cannot do more than he owes to God. For to Him he owes all that he is capable of doing. He cannot acquire a right to thanks' (*Syn. Gosp.* II, p. 543). The realisation by a son of his father's paramount claim upon his services, without thanks and without reward, need not in any way lessen his affection for him.

unprofitable. This word is omitted by the Syriac version; and some commentators (Wellhausen, Easton) think this right on the ground that its addition in the sense of 'sinful' would have been a very easy insertion for a Christian scribe who reflected on the generally sinful condition of mankind. In Matt. xxv. 30 it means, as usually, 'useless' (this is its only other occurrence in the N.T.). It is true that its retention here rather obscures the point of the parable, which is not that men are *useless* servants, but *servants.* But it may be translated simply enough as an expression of humility if the emphasis is kept on the noun: 'We are *servants*, and of little account.' The point is not that they are really useless, but that they are to be humble enough to think so themselves. 'Miser est quem Dominus servum inutilem appellat (Matt. xxv. 30): beatus qui se ipse' (Bengel).

11–19. THE TEN LEPERS

Peculiar to Luke

This story presents some difficulties (which will be noticed in the notes), and may be regarded as a developed version of the story in Luke v. 12–16 (taken from Mark i. 40–45), made with an allegorical purpose—to represent the conversion of the Gentiles (the Samaritan leper) in contrast with the unbelief of the Jews (the Jewish lepers).

11. *as they were on the way to Jerusalem.* A vague reminder of the 'journey.' Cp. ix. 51 note.

that he was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.
12 And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten
13 men that were lepers, which stood afar off: and they lifted up their voices, saying, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us.
14 And when he saw them, he said unto them, Go and shew yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, as they
15 went, they were cleansed. And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, with a loud voice glorifying

through the midst of Samaria and Galilee. There seems little doubt that 'between' is a more original reading than 'through the midst of.' The phrase must then mean 'along the border of Samaria and Galilee,' i.e. travelling eastwards—but it is a queer expression. 'The geographical indication explains how Jews and Samaritans happened to be together' (Easton).

12. 'Biblical leprosy was a mild skin disease, never fatal: the person affected with it is not sick but ceremonially unclean. . . . Modern leprosy is always fatal and is quite a different thing' (Wright).

afar off: lepers were obliged to keep at a distance from other people.

It is natural enough that lepers should have formed a little community together, but it is true that 'the fact that ten lepers should have been found together, all with sufficient faith to be healed, gives a certain extraordinary quality to the miracle' (Easton). Creed describes the passage as 'an ideal scene . . . which has taken shape in a Gentile Church,' and continues: 'Jesus is shewn as the beneficent healer who lavishes His goodness upon all who need, and receives thankful homage from the alien. We ought not, therefore, to ask whether the ungrateful nine were, or were not, saved by faith' (p. 217).

14. Cp. v. 14 and note there: also Lev. xiv. In the story in chapter v Jesus touches the man and cleanses him, and afterwards bids him go to the priest. Here He heals at a distance, the command to go to the priests is given before the cure, and the lepers have enough faith to obey. The naturalness of the earlier story tells strongly against the historical character of the later.

The twofold objection is, with reason, made to the concluding incident of the story (1) that, as Jesus had told the lepers to go to the priests at Jerusalem the 'nine' cannot be held ungrateful because they obeyed Him—a journey which might take several days; and (2) that if, as the story appears to assume, their fault was that they did not 'give glory to God,' it is not clear how this is necessarily connected with their not returning to Jesus. 'Glory to God' could be given anywhere.

It is not impossible that the story owes some of its present form to that of Naaman in 2 Kings v, to which Luke's special source has already referred in iv. 27. In that passage moreover the case of Naaman *as a foreigner* (see notes there) gives a similar point to that of the Samaritan leper here. For the interest in Samaritans shewn by Luke's special source, cp. ix. 51 f., x. 30 f.

God; and he fell upon his face at his feet, giving him thanks: 16
and he was a Samaritan. And Jesus answering said, Were 17
not the ten cleansed? but where are the nine? Were there 18
none found that returned to give glory to God, save this
stranger? And he said unto him, Arise, and go thy way: 19
thy faith hath made thee whole.

And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of 20
God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of
God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, 21
Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you.

A rather bitter note of Montefiore's, who resents the anti-Jewish feeling of the passage, is at least partially true: 'Usually Jesus is not anxious to receive thanks: here He must be made to wish for them so that the Samaritan may excel.' One can imagine that if under such circumstances all ten had returned and poured out their thanks to Him, He might well have rebuked them even so, because they did not 'give glory to God,' but to Himself.

19. Similar verses appear at the conclusion of a story in vii. 50, and viii. 48. This verse seems to be Luke's editorial conclusion. It spoils the story's point: for, as Montefiore says, 'Were not the nine others also healed? Was their faith less or the same?'

20–37. APOCALYPTIC

Cp. Matt. xxiv. 26–28, 37–41; also x. 39

'From Q, and apparently the concluding section in Q, for Luke and Matthew have no common Q material after their use of this passage. Its appropriateness as a conclusion needs no comment' (Easton). Luke inserts *vv.* 31–33 partly from Mark's 'Little Apocalypse' (Mark xiii. 15–16).

For the eschatological question as a whole see Appendix I: where a discussion is attempted of the Jewish eschatology current in Jesus' day, and of His attitude towards it.

20–22. Peculiar to Luke. The first half of *v.* 20 looks like Luke's setting for what follows: the Pharisees frequently ask for 'signs.' In an interesting passage on Luke's 'deferred eschatology' (*Making of Luke-Acts*, pp. 290–6) Cadbury points out that the general meaning of these verses is 'the end is not so near as you suppose; not yet—perhaps not in this generation.' Such an attitude would be natural as time passed, to correct excessive expectancy and rectify disillusionment.

20. *with observation*: i.e. so that you can watch for its coming and be forewarned when you see the premonitory signs.

21. *Lo, here! or, There!* Cp. Mark xiii. 21. *for lo,* .... There are two main lines of interpretation of these well-known words, upon which will also depend the sense of 'with observation' in the verse before: (1) 'The Kingdom is a spiritual one, which grows unseen, in men's

22 And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when
ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and
23 ye shall not see it. And they shall say to you, Lo, there!
24 Lo, here! go not away, nor follow after *them*: for as the
lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the
heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall
25 the Son of man be in his day. But first must he suffer many
26 things and be rejected of this generation. And as it came to

hearts.' This is to understand the Greek as meaning '*within* you.' (2) Taking the Greek as meaning '*among* you,' either (*a*) 'The Kingdom is present among you, growing already though you cannot see it,' or (*b*) 'You cannot see the Kingdom coming—it is there, among you, in a flash.' Of the first interpretation Montefiore says, with truth, 'It is natural that the modern commentator who likes to pare off from Jesus' teaching as much of the miraculous, or "Jewish," or political, or "material," element as he can, and to read into or out of it as much spiritual, universalist, and permanent, teaching as possible, is often keen to adopt and justify this interpretation' (II, p. 547). Even some of those who have no desire to minimise the place of apocalyptic expectation in Jesus' teaching find another conception here (2*a*): 'The dominant note' (of Jesus' eschatology) 'is that the coming of the Kingdom is even now imminent. Another note is, however, occasionally struck; one which suggests that it has come already, that it is actually present, in process of realization' (Latimer Jackson, *Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 42). The signs of the Kingdom's realisation are perhaps Jesus' cures of demoniacs: cp. xi. 20, 'If I by the finger of God am casting out the devils, then the Kingdom of God is close upon you.' It has been a commonplace of N.T. teaching to say that Jesus spoke of the Kingdom both as present and future: future in its complete realisation —in the Church?—but present also in Himself and His disciples, and in the results of their work. There is so little evidence for this view, and what there is is so largely capable of a different interpretation (cp. art. 'Eschatology' in *HDCG*) that Montefiore's words quoted above may justly be applied to it. The simplest interpretation, and that most in accord with the spirit of what follows here, is (2 *b*). Cp., in that case, *v.* 24. [Possibly Luke accepted interpretation (1).]

22. *one of the days of the Son of man.* This rather odd phrase is variously interpreted: 'even a single day of the final rest'—'one of the days of the new age,' which is simplest. Others understand the phrase as meaning 'You shall long to see again the time when I was with you on earth'—which does not suit the context. The 'days' which 'shall come' are days of persecution or disappointment.

23–24. Cp. *v.* 21 above. 'Their persecutions and longings will make the disciples eager to find signs of the end: they must not be led astray. When it comes, there will be no mistaking it.'

25. Cp. ix. 22.

26–30. The suddenness of the end, breaking in on men's ordinary

pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days
of the Son of man. They ate, they drank, they married, they 27
were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into
the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Like- 28
wise even as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they ate,
they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they
builded; but in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it 29
rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them
all: after the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son 30
of man is revealed. In that day, he which shall be on the 31
housetop, and his goods in the house, let him not go down
to take them away: and let him that is in the field likewise
not return back. Remember Lot's wife. Whosoever shall 32, 33
seek to gain his life shall lose it: but whosoever shall lose *his*
life shall preserve it. I say unto you, In that night there shall 34
be two men on one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other
shall be left. There shall be two women grinding together; 35
the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. And they 37
answering say unto him, Where, Lord? And he said unto
them, Where the body *is*, thither will the eagles also be
gathered together.

occupations, as in the days of the Flood or the destruction of Sodom.

31–33. Inserted by Luke from various sources: *v.* 31 is from Mark xiii. 15–16, *v.* 32 sounds like a popular proverb, and *v.* 33 is a more elaborate form of the saying already given in ix. 24. They break the general sense of the passage, which is concerned with the speed and suddenness of the end: there would be no time or opportunity for such dangerous attempts to save property as these verses prohibit. In Mark (xiii. 15) the saying given in *v.* 31 here has a natural place—when the Abomination of Desolation comes they are to flee without any delay. 'This obscure little section seems to confuse conduct on the Day of Judgment with conduct in the presence of some grave earthly danger' (Easton). Luke may have put the verses here with an allegorical intention: complete detachment from all that is material is the only right course in view of the imminence of the end.

32. Lot's wife looked back as she was leaving Sodom, and became a pillar of salt (Gen. xix. 26).

33. Cp. ix. 24 note.

34, 35. *taken* (to salvation)... *left* (to destruction).

Verse 36 (in A.V.), 'Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left,' is a gloss from Matt. xxiv. 40.

37. *Where the body*.... Matthew gives this saying in the middle of his apocalyptic discourse (xxiv. 28). Luke reserves it as the climax

18 And he spake a parable unto them to the end that they
2 ought always to pray, and not to faint; saying, There was
in a city a judge, which feared not God, and regarded not
3 man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came oft
4 unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he
would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself,
5 Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this
widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest she wear me out
6 by her continual coming. And the Lord said, Hear what the

of the present passage, and gives it the Apostles' question as a setting of its own. The saying is a proverb: the *eagles* are vultures which appear from nowhere when an animal falls dead. 'Had Amos written it he might have said, "Shall a corpse lie on the ground and the vultures not be gathered there?"' (McNeile). As applied here it seems to mean 'Wherever there is corruption, there will the Judgement be.' Matthew uses it more appropriately, of the *inevitability* of the Son of Man's coming.

XVIII. 1–8. THE WIDOW AND THE JUDGE

Peculiar to Luke

The point of the parable itself (*vv.* 2–5) is simply the duty—and wisdom—of perseverance in prayer. It may owe its origin to Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 12 f.: 'The Lord is judge, and with Him is no respect of persons. He will not accept any person against a poor man; and He will listen to the prayer of him that is wronged. He will in no wise despise the supplication of the fatherless; nor the widow when she poureth out her tale. Do not the tears of the widow run down her cheeks? And is not her cry against him that hath caused them to fall?' It is similar in point to the parable of the Persistent Friend in xi. 5 f., and may have originally stood side by side with that parable. Here, however, it refers particularly to prayer for the Second Coming, in continuation of the thought of the last chapter.

2. Here again—as in xi. 8 and xvi. 1 f.—an illustration is taken from an action or character which is not in itself good. See notes on those two passages: and also (for the danger of over-allegorisation) on xv. 25.

4. 'The judge's soliloquy is framed to point the moral, not to give words that such a man would have used' (Easton).

Verses 2–5, taken by themselves, have the same application as the parable of the Persistent Friend (xi. 5 f.). If a human judge, who is admittedly cruel and unjust, eventually grants a request persistently made, in order to save himself trouble, how much more will God, the all-loving Father, hear and answer His children's prayers. This is the idea which Luke has expressed in his introduction in *v.* 1. But the addition of *vv.* 6–8 gives the parable an eschatological turn, by pressing the point that what the widow asked for was 'vengeance.'

unrighteous judge saith. And shall not God avenge his elect, 7
which cry to him day and night, and he is longsuffering over
them? I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily. 8
Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith
on the earth?

And he spake also this parable unto certain which trusted 9
in themselves that they were righteous, and set all others at
nought: Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one 10
a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and 11
prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not
as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even
as this publican. I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all 12

7. 'God cannot be slow to hear the prayers of the faithful, and bring in the Kingdom.'

and he is longsuffering over them? i.e. God is not impatient with the cries of His elect. Another possible translation is, 'and is He slow to help them?'

8. *Howbeit etc.* If these words were spoken by Jesus, they reflect the same weariness and sadness which we have noticed in xii. 50, 'how am I straitened till it be accomplished!' 'The Kingdom will come, and come quickly: but when it comes how many faithful will there be to enter it?' *faith* will then simply mean the individual's faith in God, that will save him when the Kingdom comes. Others have seen a reference to later Christianity, 'the Faith,' and regard the whole phrase as the product of persecution and despondency in the early Church. 'If the Kingdom does not come soon, will there be any faithful Christians left?' But the words may well come from Jesus.

9–14. THE TWO PRAYERS

Peculiar to Luke

9. Luke's reason for putting this parable here is probably the simple one that he has now come to a point at which he is about to rejoin Mark, and has not found a place for it before. This verse is his own introduction to the parable.

10. *went up*: i.e. up the hill to the Temple.

It should be remembered that standing was, and is, the usual Jewish attitude of prayer. The word has therefore no special significance here.

12. Two fasts, on Monday and Thursday, every week all the year round, appear to have been observed by the strictest Jews, but not by the majority even of Pharisees. They were not enjoined by the Law. Moreover, whereas the Law only enforced tithes on corn, wine, oil and animals (Deut. xiv. 23), the Pharisee paid tithes on *all* his income, from whatever source. Cp. Matt. xxiii. 23, 'You pay tithes on mint and anise and cummin.' 'He does even more than the Law requires both

13 that I get. But the publican, standing afar off, would not
lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote his breast,
14 saying, God, be merciful to me a sinner. I say unto you,
This man went down to his house justified rather than the
other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled;
but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.
15 And they brought unto him also their babes, that he should
touch them: but when the disciples saw it, they rebuked
16 them. But Jesus called them unto him, saying, Suffer the
little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of
17 such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whoso-

as to fasting and tithing. His piety is supereminent, and he is proud of it' (Montefiore). The Pharisee's pride is quite sincere.

14. *justified*: i.e. in the sight of God. It is his prayer, and not the other's, which God counts the prayer of a righteous man.

In considering this parable, with its justly famous contrast, the Christian reader may, as often, find some remarks of Montefiore helpful to preserve a true sense of proportion. 'No parable in the Gospels is more characteristic than this. None reflects better an essential feature of the teaching of Jesus. A legal religion has its dangers. However unjust Paul was to its merits, it has the defects of its qualities.... And what they are is inimitably hit off in this admirable story. But this is not to say that the Pharisee of the story is the usual or characteristic product of the Rabbinic religion. He is the characteristic caricature or perversion of that religion' (*Syn. Gospels*, II, p. 556).

15–17. JESUS AND THE CHILDREN

Mark x. 13 f.; Matt. xix. 13 f.

Luke here returns to Mark, whom he forsook at ix. 50 (at the end of Mark's ninth chapter). He omits Mark x. 1–12 (on divorce), of which he has already given the gist in a single verse (Luke xvi. 18). He may well have felt Mark's longer and strictly Jewish treatment of the subject unsuitable for his Gentile readers.

15. *touch*, i.e. 'bless.' The disciples did not want Jesus troubled, and His time wasted, on this kind of thing.

16. Mark has 'But when Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation, and said unto them.' Both Matthew and Luke omit the strong word, 'was angry,' as too human for Jesus.

for of such.... These words have a dramatic force which familiarity obscures. 'Stop the children—No! For the Kingdom of God belongs to them'—and those like them. The words 'of such' may be taken both literally and figuratively (cp. 'these little ones' in xvii. 2, and note there). 'Humble trust, a complete lack of assertiveness, no consciousness of "merit" or desert, simple confidence and purity—

ever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.

18 And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what
19 shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, *even* God.

these are the qualities which Jesus means to indicate in the character of the true child' (Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels*, I, p. 237).

18–23. THE RICH 'RULER'

Mark x. 17 f.; Matt. xix. 16 f.

Commentators quote Shakespeare's appreciation of the contrast between the incident and the verses which precede it:

> 'No thought is contented. The better sort,
> As thoughts of things divine, are intermixed
> With scruples, and do set the word itself
> Against the word:
> As thus "Come, little ones," and then again
> "It is as hard to come as for a camel
> To thread the postern of a small needle's eye."'
> (*Richard II*, Act v, Sc. v.)

18. *a certain ruler.* Mark refers to him simply as 'a certain man.' Matthew calls him 'a young man.' Luke makes him 'a ruler,' not probably in the sense of a synagogue 'ruler,' but, as the story suggests, a person of position and property.

Good Master. There seems little reason for such words as those of Rawlinson, 'The epithet appears to have been a somewhat obsequious piece of conventional flattery' (*Mark*, p. 138), or Adeney, 'The ruler addresses Jesus in a shallow, unthinking style' (*Luke, ad loc.*). Lagrange seems nearer the truth, 'The rich "unknown" is very probably under the spell of the extreme "goodness" which Jesus has shewn towards the children in spite of the opposition of His disciples' (i.e. in the last section) (*Marc*, p. 248). The word may well have been spoken with sincerity, but with an emphasis which Jesus' modesty is quick to reject.

19. *Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, even God.* In this reply of Jesus Luke follows Mark exactly. Matthew's alteration of the passage is highly significant. He alters the question in *v.* 18 into 'Master, what good thing shall I do...?' and rewrites Jesus' answer thus: 'Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good.' (This will be seen only in the R.V. text of Matthew. A.V. has an inferior reading which has been assimilated to Mark and Luke.)

Matthew is only the first of a long series of Christian interpreters who have felt the difficulty of reconciling this passage, as Mark and Luke give it, with their preconceived ideas about Jesus. Matthew was in a more fortunate position than his successors, for he had no compunction in altering what he found in Mark. Those to whom this

course was not open have been forced, in the interests of orthodoxy, to a variety of unnatural interpretations, e.g. 'You must not call Me good, unless you also recognise Me as God,' i.e. 'None is good save God: if I am good, I must therefore also be God.' Others compare the Johannine thought of God working in Jesus (John v. 19 f.): 'as God is the centre and source of goodness and the only one absolutely good in Himself—for our Lord's goodness is dependent on His union with His Father—the title of absolute goodness is not to be given to any man, and therefore not even to Jesus'; or again, 'In His human nature Christ would not accept the title "good" until His probation was passed.' The tendency of some commentators to preserve their orthodoxy at the cost of making Jesus speak in riddles is illustrated by the author of the sentence last quoted, who continues, 'The full import of the answer would be unintelligible to the ruler and to His disciples.' No wonder!

The difficulty, which Matthew felt it necessary to avoid, of this 'denial of goodness' on the part of Jesus does not exist for those who are willing to admit, without reservation, the reality of Jesus' Humanity. The words must be given their full and natural sense. 'I am not good: God alone is good. I have no short cut to heaven for you. God's will must be your guide.' Jesus' attitude towards God was always that of a man towards God. Jesus never claimed Divinity for Himself. He did not say to His disciples 'I am God and you are men.' He urged them to look on God as He looked on Him, as the source of all human life, both His and theirs. Jesus did not stand on the dais by God's throne and call down to men to come into the Presence. He was in the crowd below, and His words to those around Him were 'Let us go up together—to your God and Mine.' He could point out to men where salvation might be found: but God's must be the hand to give it.

If this passage is felt to have a bearing on the doctrine of Jesus' 'sinlessness,' some remarks of Dr Montefiore, the Jewish commentator, may be noted: 'The historic Jesus would, I think, have been much disconcerted at the idea of sinless moral perfection being ascribed to Him... Jesus meant no more and no less than what any unsophisticated and unprejudiced reader would understand Him to mean.... Only God is good in the sense of faultless. If Jesus was in the human sense "good," He was also humble.... The divine being may know himself sinless; a *man* can only sin in fancying that he is without sin.... We may be sure that, of Jesus both in fact and in His own estimate of Himself, the adage was true: "there is no man that sinneth not"' (*Syn. Gospels*, I, p. 240). There are, I suppose, even to-day, few Christians who would go with Dr Montefiore all the way: but there are far fewer, I think, than there were a generation ago, to whom what he writes would seem to be blasphemy. Some words of Dean Rashdall sum up the situation: 'The only evidence for the belief in the absolute sinlessness of Jesus that can be produced is negative evidence—the marked absence of that sense of sin which is so prominent a feature of the religious consciousness of the men who have otherwise most closely approximated to the goodness of Christ.... It is so difficult to form a clear conception of what we mean by absolute sinlessness, and so

Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, 20
Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour
thy father and mother. And he said, All these things have 21
I observed from my youth up. And when Jesus heard it, he 22
said unto him, One thing thou lackest yet: sell all that thou

impossible, considering the extreme imperfection of our record, to *prove* such sinlessness, that it seems to me best to avoid attempts at definition' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 184 f.).

20. Luke puts the seventh commandment before the sixth, following what is probably the original order in Mark, though the MSS vary there. He follows Mark also in putting the fifth last. The reason for this is not clear. 'Luke's order for the sixth and seventh is found also in Rom. xiii. 9, James ii. 11...and is probably due to some liturgical practice' (Easton).

No doubt the rich man was disappointed at the answer. 'There is no royal road to eternal life,' Jesus says, 'the old way is the only way —keep the commandments.' Such an answer must have seemed to him as dull as did Elisha's message to Naaman to wash in Jordan (2 Kings v): 'Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper....' It has been suggested that Jesus saw in the rich man a certain unwillingness to decide for himself, and so tells him not to come to Him for what God already plainly taught. However that may be, no doubt the man expected something new and striking, perhaps even some ritual act or formula. But Jesus brings him back to the old moral standard of duty to one's neighbour, though a moment later He shows him with dramatic force how far-reaching the demands of that duty may be.

21. The man's answer is sincere enough. His manner must have shewn that: for in Mark there follows the vivid phrase, 'Jesus looked on him, and loved him'—a memory preserved by Peter, perhaps, of Jesus' expression, attracted by the man's eagerness and longing to win him (Matthew and Luke both omit this touch of emotion). But he may have had very limited ideas of what 'keeping the commandments' meant—ideas which centred rather upon 'innocence' than positive well-doing.

from my youth up. It is possible that Matthew's description of him as 'a young man' was mistakenly derived from these words in Mark which he omits. On the other hand, Matthew may have independently called him 'a young man,' and been forced to leave out 'from my youth up' later, since it would then have no point. It is impossible to decide whether he really was young: his eagerness and Jesus' sympathy and affection for him suggest youth, but 'from my youth' has some weight on the other side.

22. I have already quoted (xiv. 26 note, p. 156) a passage from Rashdall's *Conscience and Christ* which has an important bearing on one aspect of this verse: and in the note on xvi. 13 (p. 168) another sentence from the same passage which illustrates the other aspect of

hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have
23 treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. But when he heard
these things, he became exceeding sorrowful; for he was very

the words. For, as Montefiore says, Jesus' reply is 'relative (*a*) to the particular individual, (*b*) to the particular epoch.' That is to say, (*a*) Jesus is not to be regarded as having laid down here a general rule of complete poverty for all aspirants to the Kingdom. The rich man has been religious, in a sense; he had lived a respectable life: but he had not learnt what real sacrifice meant. Jesus sees that this is what is necessary, *in his particular case*; and so offers him the challenge, 'Come, follow Me'—a challenge to which the response involved complete renunciation of wealth and property for one who was to share Jesus' missionary work—which Rashdall describes as 'something like the life of a mendicant friar.' Moreover, (*b*) Jesus' belief in the nearness of the Kingdom no doubt affected the form of His teaching about wealth and property, and His own attitude towards them. When allowance is made for this, 'the principle that underlies all His teaching about property is simply this—that wealth should be treated as completely subordinate to the higher ends of human life, not only for the individual himself, but for the whole community' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 155).

23. *he became exceeding sorrowful.* Luke and Matthew both omit Mark's vivid phrase 'his countenance fell at the saying.' The 'Gospel of the Hebrews' describes the scene thus: 'But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said unto him: How sayest thou: I have kept the law and the prophets? For it is written in the law: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, and lo, many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clad in filth, dying for hunger, and thine house is full of many good things, and nought at all goeth out of it unto them.' (Tr. by M. R. James in *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 6.)

[The 'Gospel of the Hebrews' seems to have been a somewhat different version of our St Matthew, used by a Jewish Christian sect called the Nazarenes. Only fragments of it survive, in various other writers. That quoted above is given in the Latin Version of Origen's commentary on Matthew.]

If difficulty is felt about Jesus' advice to the man, it is well to remember that 'he went away sorrowful—not because an enlightened political economy had told him that this renunciation would not be the best thing he could do, not because he doubted whether it would, if generally imitated, be conducive to the true good of humanity, or because he felt a call to other work which could better be done with his possessions than without them—but simply because "he had great possessions"' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 153). 'Jesus divined where the shoe would pinch. If the man was really keen about goodness, let him make the one great sacrifice which would prove his keenness' (Montefiore).

rich. And Jesus seeing him said, How hardly shall they that 24
have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier 25
for a camel to enter in through a needle's eye, than for a
rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they that 26
heard it said, Then who can be saved? But he said, The 27
things which are impossible with men are possible with God.
And Peter said, Lo, we have left our own, and followed thee. 28
And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no 29

24–27. WEALTH AND THE KINGDOM

Mark x. 23 f.; Matt. xix. 23 f.

Much of what has been said in the notes to the preceding section applies also to these verses, and need not be repeated: cp. particularly also the note on xvi. 13.

24. Jesus looks after the man as he goes away, and speaks to His disciples rather sadly.

Two points should be remembered in connection with this verse: (1) Jesus seems to have regarded *humility* as an essential qualification for entry to the Kingdom; and in Jesus' day it was extremely difficult for great wealth and humility to go hand in hand. For, (2) a far weaker idea of *responsibility* then attached to the possession of wealth or property than in modern times. In fact, the idea of wealth's responsibilities is itself largely the product of Christianity.

25. This saying, of which the words about the camel are no doubt proverbial, should be taken quite literally, perhaps with a touch of humour, to express something of extreme difficulty or even of impossibility. But it must be supplemented by the words in *v.* 27: 'Can a rich man make his way into the Kingdom? No! But God can let him in.' Plato says in the *Laws* that a man cannot both be very good and very rich. Human experience will admit that it is an exceedingly hard thing for an extremely wealthy man to lead the highest kind of life.

26. *Then who can be saved?* 'If a rich man can't, who can?' 'Such an opinion is common in "popular" theology everywhere' (Easton).

28–30. REWARDS

Mark x. 28 f.; Matt. xix. 27 f.

28. 'We have done what you told that rich man to do.'

29–30. Both Matthew and Luke are a good deal shorter than Mark here; Mark has '. . . who shall not receive a hundredfold—now, in this time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life.' Some think that Matthew and Luke give the original Q form of the saying: and in any case Mark's detailed and material enumeration seems to represent the experience of the early Church, when those who had given up much for their faith found new relationships and compensations in their Church, rather than the mind of Jesus. For not only

man that hath left house, or wife, or brethren, or parents,
30 or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not
receive manifold more in this time, and in the world to come
eternal life.
31 And he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them,
Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are
written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son
32 of man. For he shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and
shall be mocked, and shamefully entreated, and spit upon:

did He 'not look forward to any such developments...and therefore had no occasion to prophesy this kind of terrestrial compensation, seeing that He expected the whole existing order of things to terminate in the near future' (Warschauer, *Hist. Life of Christ*, p. 235); but He always views 'rewards' as spiritual, and belonging to the future life (cp. xvi. 9 note, quotations from Rashdall).

Luke's version of the passage, then, simply implies that those who have forsaken all will not fail to find compensations of infinitely greater value—and will, above all, win eternal life. The 'compensations' are not defined. If the view of Mark's longer version which is given above is accepted, Luke's *in this time* (which is taken from Mark and is not represented in Matthew's form of the saying) will be regarded as secondary, and the whole verse will refer to the 'coming age.'

29. *wife.* Luke adds this, as at xiv. 26. Those early Christian commentators who interpreted the saying as referring to material earthly rewards found the idea of 'receiving back' one's wife 'manifold more' extremely difficult!

31–34. THIRD PREDICTION OF THE PASSION

Mark x. 32 f.; Matt. xx. 17 f.

Cp. the notes on Luke ix. 22 f. and 43 f.—the first two predictions recorded. This is the third prediction recorded by all three Synoptists. Luke has given three other less definite references to the Passion in xii. 49–50, xiii. 33 and xvii. 25.

Luke omits the rather striking verse in Mark (x. 32), 'And they were on the road going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going in front of them: and they were amazed, and those that followed were afraid'—awed by the sternness of His expression as He goes resolutely forward to the death awaiting Him at Jerusalem. Luke has already given a similar idea in ix. 51.

31. *and all the things...Son of man.* These words are not in Mark, but may be regarded, in Loisy's words, as a 'theological paraphrase' of Mark's 'the things that were to happen to him' in the verse before. Luke returns to this theme in xxiv. 25–27 and 45–47: and it is, of course, frequent in Acts.

32. Luke leaves out Mark's reference to the 'high priests and scribes' and their condemnation of Jesus, perhaps because he does not,

and they shall scourge and kill him: and the third day he 33
shall rise again. And they understood none of these things; 34
and this saying was hid from them, and they perceived not
the things that were said.

And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho, a certain 35
blind man sat by the way side begging: and hearing a multi- 36
tude going by, he inquired what this meant. And they told 37
him, that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by. And he cried, saying, 38
Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me. And they that 39
went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but
he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have
mercy on me. And Jesus stood, and commanded him to be 40
brought unto him: and when he was come near, he asked
him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? And he 41
said, Lord, that I may receive my sight. And Jesus said 42
unto him, Receive thy sight: thy faith hath made thee whole.

in his own account of the Passion, describe any formal trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin.

The *Gentiles* are the Romans. Luke follows Mark closely here. For the strong probability that the present detailed form of these prophecies is due to the influence of after-events cp. notes on ix. 22 and 44. Matthew's introduction of 'crucify' in the parallel to this verse (Matt. xx. 19) shews the process going on.

35–43. BARTIMAEUS HEALED

Mark x. 46 f.; Matt. xx. 29 f.

Luke omits Mark x. 35–45, the request made by the sons of Zebedee, followed by teaching on humility. (This teaching Luke gives later (xxii. 24–27) in a somewhat different form.) He may have felt reluctant to include a story which presented James and John in a somewhat unfavourable light. Matthew, while including the story, altered it so as to throw the responsibility for the request on to their *mother*, no doubt with the same feeling (Matt. xx. 20).

35. *a certain blind man.* Mark gives his name, 'Bartimaeus,' an Aramaic word, 'son of Timaeus.' Luke avoids all Hebrew words.

38. *thou son of David*: 'the most characteristic, as it is the most traditional and historic, designation of the Jewish Messiah. It expresses the most representative type of Messianic expectation, if we understand by that term an anointed Jewish king who was to be the national deliverer' (*HDCG*). Whether the blind man was likely at this stage to have hailed Jesus as Messiah is doubtful.

40. Luke abbreviates Mark, who tells how the crowd passed on Jesus' words, and how the blind man 'threw off his cloak and leapt up,' and came to Jesus.

43 And immediately he received his sight, and followed him,
glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw it, gave
praise unto God.

19 And he entered and was passing through Jericho.
2 And behold, a man called by name Zacchæus; and he was a
3 chief publican, and he was rich. And he sought to see Jesus
who he was; and could not for the crowd, because he was little
4 of stature. And he ran on before, and climbed up into a
5 sycomore tree to see him: for he was to pass that way. And
when Jesus came to the place, he looked up, and said unto
him, Zacchæus, make haste, and come down; for to-day I
6 must abide at thy house. And he made haste, and came
7 down, and received him joyfully. And when they saw it,
they all murmured, saying, He is gone in to lodge with a

XIX. 1–10. ZACCHAEUS

Peculiar to Luke (cp. the call of Levi, v. 27 f.)

2. *Zacchæus.* A Jewish name, an abbreviation of Zechariah, which seems to mean 'the pure.' Luke does not usually give proper names: perhaps he felt there was some symbolism in this case; or perhaps Zacchaeus was well known.

'A *chief publican* must have been an official with general superintendence over the publicans of a district; Jericho as the eastern gateway for Judaea's trade had especially important revenues' (Easton). Cp. iii. 12 note.

4. *a sycomore tree*: the Greek word means literally a 'fig-mulberry': the sycomore (not the English sycamore, cp. xvii. 6) is said to be 'very easy to climb, with its short trunk, and wide lateral branches forking out in all directions.'

Under the heading 'Sycamore,' Boulger (*Familiar Trees*) says: 'Confused in Western Europe, at an early period, with the true Sycomore or Fig Mulberry of Scripture, a confusion which is still retained in the language of flowers, according to which mystic code of symbols the tree signifies "curiosity" because it is identified with that on which Zacchaeus climbed that he might see Christ. This confusion seems to have led to a considerable planting of the tree by religious persons in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries' (p. 154).

5. Jesus sees him in the tree, is struck by his anxiety to get a good view ('Eagerness always appealed to the Lord's own temperament' (Warschauer)—cp. the Rich Man in ch. xviii), and perhaps by the eagerness of his expression, enquires who he is, and calls to him, asking him for hospitality. [Luke probably thought Jesus' knowledge of Zacchaeus supernatural.]

6–7. 'It was an unusual honour for a tax-gatherer to entertain a rabbi, even a heterodox rabbi, and we can understand the haste with

man that is a sinner. And Zacchæus stood, and said unto 8
the Lord, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the
poor; and if I have wrongfully exacted aught of any man,
I restore fourfold. And Jesus said unto him, To-day is salva- 9
tion come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of
Abraham. For the Son of man came to seek and to save that 10
which was lost.

which Zacchaeus descended and led his Guest to his house, amid the disgusted murmurs of the respectable' (Warschauer, p. 238).

8. It seems likely, if this incident is, as there is little reason to doubt, historic (Loisy sees in it an allegory of the salvation of the Gentiles, 'the true children of Abraham'—rather unnaturally, since Zacchaeus is presumably a Jew), that events did not move as quickly as the story suggests: but that Zacchaeus spent some time in conversation with Jesus before he was so far 'converted' as to utter the vow in this verse.

I restore fourfold. Most commentators explain 'fourfold' by reference to Ex. xxii. 1, or 4 and 7, where fourfold reparation is laid down for cases of robbery where the stolen goods have been disposed of: for cases where the property is recovered double was to be restored (in that case Zacchaeus voluntarily gives twice as much as he need; but it is simpler to assume that he regarded his own frauds as meriting the severer penalty described above).

9. Jesus' words have been taken in two senses: (1) If Zacchaeus was a Gentile, to imply that his conduct now has won him admission to the 'household of Israel,' and so saved him. (2) If Zacchaeus was a Jew, to assert that in spite of his despised profession and unfair dealing he has proved himself a true son of Abraham, and so won salvation. The latter is the more probable. 'Luke could not have thought that a man with such a name as Zacchaeus' (cp. Ezra ii. 9: a Hebrew name) 'was a Gentile' (Easton).

10. Cp. Ezek. xxxiv. 16: 'I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick....' Cp. also v. 32: 'I have not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance,' and the parables in ch. xv—the 'lost' sheep, coin and son.

11–27. THE PARABLE OF THE MINAE

Cp. Matt. xxv. 14 f., 'the Talents'

The exact relation of Luke's parable to that in Matthew is not easy to determine. Conservative scholars emphasise the differences in detail, and argue that the parables are quite distinct. It is hard to find any grounds for the belief, by which such argument seems to be inspired, that to admit that the two parables are different versions of the same story is somehow discreditable to the evangelists, or lessens the credibility of their narrative. If their connection be admitted, the

11 And as they heard these things, he added and spake a
parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and *because* they
supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to
12 appear. He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a
far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.

differences may be variously explained: (1) Luke has combined two parables, or added a historical setting to the original parable. Thus *vv.* 11, 14, 15*a* and 27 (with some other details)—which are universally regarded as referring to contemporary history (see note below)—may have been a separate parable, though, if so, scarcely to be attributed to Jesus Himself. Or Luke may have added them himself. If these verses are removed, the remainder is fairly parallel to Matthew, though still too different to come from the same written Greek source. (2) Streeter says: 'A glance at a Synopsis shews that in the latter part of this parable the verbal agreements between the two versions are such as to favour, though not actually to compel, the assumption of a common written source. But the divergences between the versions in the first half are so great as to make this assumption highly improbable. Here again the Gospel according to the Hebrews' (cp. xvii. 3 note) 'may help us. Eusebius tells us that the Parable of the Talents stood in this Gospel but "told of three servants, one who devoured his Lord's substance with harlots and flute girls, one who gained profit manifold, and one who hid his talent; and then how one was accepted, one merely blamed, and one shut up in prison." Is it not possible that M' (Matthew's special source) 'had a version something like this, and that Matthew has conflated Q and M, following M more closely at the beginning and Q at the end? Luke, then, preserves approximately the Q form' (*The Four Gospels*, p. 282).

Luke's introduction to the parable in *v.* 11 shews that its interest is to him eschatological. 'The object of the parable to Luke is to refute or explain a difficulty of the first Christian generations' (Montefiore): i.e. to answer the question widely asked in Luke's own day, 'Why has the Kingdom not yet come?' 'Much lies between the arrival in Jerusalem, and the coming of the Kingdom.' As regards the original meaning of the parable, if spoken by Jesus—the 'embassy' story being regarded as an addition—two views are possible: either, eschatologically, the duty of making the best possible use of the time till the Kingdom comes; or, more generally, the duty of using God's gifts well.

11. Jericho is eighteen miles from Jerusalem. For the thought see note above: 'the Messiah near Jerusalem—then the Kingdom must be near.' Cp. Acts i. 6, the disciples' question 'Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' For the prevalence of such apocalyptic expectation in the early Church, and for its place in Jesus' own thought, see Introduction, Appendix I.

12. This verse, together with *vv.* 14 and 27 below, refers to the dealings of the Herod family with the authorities at Rome. Herod the Great had gone to Rome in 40 B.C. and had been made king of Judaea:

And he called ten servants of his, and gave them ten pounds, 13
and said unto them, Trade ye *herewith* till I come. But his 14
citizens hated him, and sent an ambassage after him, saying,
We will not that this man reign over us. And it came to pass, 15
when he was come back again, having received the kingdom,
that he commanded these servants, unto whom he had given
the money, to be called to him, that he might know what
they had gained by trading. And the first came before him, 16
saying, Lord, thy pound hath made ten pounds more. And 17
he said unto him, Well done, thou good servant: because thou
wast found faithful in a very little, have thou authority over
ten cities. And the second came, saying, Thy pound, Lord, 18
hath made five pounds. And he said unto him also, Be thou 19
also over five cities. And another came, saying, Lord, be- 20
hold, *here is* thy pound, which I kept laid up in a napkin:

and in 4 B.C. Archelaus went on a similar errand, to claim his father's kingdom. A deputation of fifty Jews journeyed to Rome to oppose his claim.

13. *pounds; minae,* xii. 6 note; worth each something under £4. Matthew's 'talent' is sixty times as much.

'To Luke this whole narrative was a transparent allegory of the Church during the absence of Christ. The number "ten" probably signified completeness to him, representing Christians in general (Weiss). If he interpreted the gift of the minas he probably thought of the gifts of the Spirit' (Easton, p. 280).

The servants are to be tested during their master's absence, so that when he returns, if his mission is successful, he may have trustworthy occupants for his offices of state. In Matthew there are three servants, who receive different amounts: this is not so natural a method of testing ability as that in Luke, of giving all ten the same.

17–19. The reward for using small opportunities and responsibility well is to be given greater. Christian interpretation has always found in the parable the lesson that it is man's supreme duty to use to the full all that is best in his human nature during his life on earth; and that neglect of this duty will mean the loss of the power to perform it.

20. Luke's 'mina' is a small enough sum of money to be wrapped in a 'napkin,' while Matthew's 'talent' has to be buried.

If the cautious servant's action is to be given a religious significance, some words of Dr Edward Lyttelton are worth notice: 'The servant shewed respect for the gift, but from an insane view of its meaning dealt with it so as to deprive it of all value. If we take the "talent" to mean the faculty of learning to know God...it will be seen how weighty is the warning against a perfectly decorous but irreligious life....The refusal of God's offer is the very essence of madness, though it often looks to the world as if it were the essence of common sense.' (From a sermon preached on leaving Eton.)

21 for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest
up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst
22 not sow. He saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will
I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I am
an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping
23 that I did not sow; then wherefore gavest thou not my money
into the bank, and I at my coming should have required it
24 with interest? And he said unto them that stood by, Take
away from him the pound, and give it unto him that hath
25 the ten pounds. And they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten
26 pounds. I say unto you, that unto every one that hath shall
be given; but from him that hath not, even that which he
27 hath shall be taken away from him. Howbeit these mine
enemies, which would not that I should reign over them,
bring hither, and slay them before me.

21. His master is a hard business-man, eager to make a profit, and not likely to forgive a mistake.

22. 'The master accepts the servant's characterisation of him with grim complacency. Indeed the servant has underestimated the hardness of his character; he is almost as angry at the failure of possible profit as he would have been at actual loss' (Easton).

23. At least he could have put the money in a bank. It would have earned some interest there, without any appreciable risk of loss.

26. Lagrange on Mark iv. 25 (parallel to Luke viii. 18, where this saying occurs in a somewhat different form) suggests that this saying 'may be a popular proverb coined perhaps by some cynical observer of oriental society, who had noticed how presents were given to rich men, while the poor man, who had nothing, was fleeced to the last farthing' (Rawlinson, *Mark*, p. 55; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 111). In the earlier context the saying apparently refers to receptivity of spiritual truth. 'In spiritual things he who receives and makes his own that which is first given to him will receive a yet richer gift, whereas he who through carelessness and inattention fails to do so will lose it—and more.' Here it is referred to the use of opportunity—which brings greater opportunities in its train.

The original meaning and context of such short proverbial sayings cannot now be determined. Jesus may Himself have used them in a variety of contexts to point His meaning—just as is the case with proverbial sayings in modern speech to-day; others may have been attached to His words by Christian reporters and editors. Cp. an interesting article by David Smith in *HDCG*, 'Proverbs': with reference to the present example he quotes a saying of R. Hillel, 'He who increases not, decreases.'

27. Luke's conclusion, in keeping with his historical setting. Matthew has a different, but equally vindictive, ending: 'And cast ye

And when he had thus spoken, he went on before, going 28
up to Jerusalem.

the useless servant into the outer darkness; there shall the weeping be and the gnashing of teeth.' Neither are part of the original parable. No doubt Luke is thinking of the fall of Jerusalem and the massacres which attended it.

28–38. THE ENTRY

Mark xi. 1–10; Matt. xxi. 1–9

The significance of the incident recorded in this section has been very variously interpreted. Luke follows Mark closely in *vv.* 28–36 ('The Obtaining of the Colt'), but of *vv.* 37–44, 39–44 are quite independent of Mark (with a possible affinity to Matt. xxi. 14–16), and 37–38 so little akin to Mark, that it is best to regard the whole passage 37–44 as taken by Luke from another source. Luke's version is as a whole less Messianic and 'triumphal' than Mark's. [Taylor (*Behind the Third Gospel*, p. 236), who describes the passage *vv.* 37–44 as 'the Approach to Jerusalem,' thinks that the Lucan story records 'an early tradition out of which the Marcan narrative grew. Certainly the Lucan incident is simpler and intrinsically the more convincing.' According to his view, *vv.* 37–44 stood in Proto-Luke, and Luke has combined with it *vv.* 28–36 from Mark.] This leads to the crux of the whole question—was the Entry Messianically significant? There are three main views with regard to this:

(1) The traditional one, shewn most strongly in Matthew (xxi. 10–11), less strongly in Mark, and scarcely emphasised at all in Luke, that the Entry was a public claim to Messiahship, and publicly interpreted as such. Thus Plummer: 'What He had hitherto concealed, or obscurely indicated, or revealed only to a chosen few, He now, seeing that the fulness of time is come, makes known to the whole world. He publicly claims to be Messiah. This triumphal procession is the Holy One of God making solemn entry into the Holy City' (p. 448). This is in keeping with Mark's view, of course accepted by the other evangelists, that the obtaining of the colt exhibited a supernatural foreknowledge on Jesus' part. Thus: 'The Evangelist thinks of the whole episode as having been designed and arranged by Jesus in accordance with His insight into the purposes of God. The ass was provided and ready, as He knew that it would be; He foresaw that the protests of its owners would at once be abandoned when His message was given; and the ass was...an animal meet for the service required of it, since it was a colt "whereon no man ever yet sat"' (Rawlinson, *Mark*, p. 151, though he does not accept this point of view).

(2) Even when allowance is made for the point of view from which the story is told, and the events connected with the colt interpreted without any supernatural implication, there are several reasons which make it impossible to accept the view given above. The strongest is that the Entry is not mentioned as evidence against Jesus at His trial. If it had been a public claim and recognition of Messiahship, there

would have been numerous witnesses of it—and it would have relieved the Jewish authorities of the necessity of finding any other evidence at all. A second may be given in Warschauer's words (p. 248): 'To enter the capital riding on an ass was not to declare His Messiahship to the multitudes. The ass has been a common mount in the East, from the days of Balaam the son of Peor to our own days; strangers riding into the Holy City on such animals were to be seen any day, so that such a spectacle would not in itself have excited special attention, far less suggested a Messianic claim on the Rider's part, even if everybody had had all the Messianic prophecies at his fingers' ends' (i.e. for instance Zech. ix. 9 quoted in Matt. xxi. 5: see below). A third is that if the shouts of the crowds as recorded by the various evangelists are examined, it will be seen that the only words upon which they are all agreed are 'Hosanna! Blessed is he' (Luke 'the king') 'that cometh in the name of the Lord,' words taken from Ps. cxviii. 26, and commonly used to welcome pilgrims who came up to Jerusalem for a festival, as they approached the Temple. If this is to be regarded as the original cry, and the remainder due to the amplification or explanation of tradition or of the evangelists themselves (in Mark and Matthew 'hosanna in the highest,' paraphrased by Luke as 'peace in heaven and glory in the highest' (cp. ii. 14), seems to be due to a misunderstanding of 'hosanna' as a cry of homage, 'glory to,' rather than its real sense as a prayer, 'save now'; cp. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 221), the welcome is not necessarily Messianic at all. Dalman (*op. cit.*) says: 'The procession on Palm Sunday did not acquire its pronounced Messianic colouring till a later period. The Teacher and Miracle-worker from Nazareth was then welcomed with jubilation, and accompanied with invocation of blessings' (p. 222).

Such considerations as these have led to two similar views: (A) that of Loisy, that the whole incident has been constructed upon a basis of prophecy—i.e. Zech. ix. 9 and xiv. 4, under the influence also of Gen. xlix. 11 and Ps. cxviii. 25–26 (*Luc*, p. 469); (B) that partly suggested in the quotation from Taylor at the beginning of this note, that the Entry of Jesus was attended by nothing 'Messianic'; or that if He was acclaimed by the populace, it happened without His intention and was short-lived, and had no special importance: and that the colt incident, if historical, was equally commonplace and afterwards developed into its present form; or is unhistorical and grew out of the simpler story in Luke *vv.* 37–44 on the basis of Zech. ix. 9 ('Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion:... behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass,' quoted in Matt. xxi. 5 and John xii. 15). I have called these two views similar in that both agree that there was no Messianic significance in the event to the mind of Jesus Himself.

(3) But there is also the possibility that while the Entry was not designed as a 'Messianic demonstration,' at any rate to the populace at large, it had for Jesus Himself a Messianic significance, and was perhaps meant to be significant also for His own followers. The prophecy from Zechariah given above would have a special appeal to Jesus, for it pictures the Messiah as humble and peaceable in contrast

And it came to pass, when he drew nigh unto Bethphage 29
and Bethany, at the mount that is called *the mount* of Olives,
he sent two of the disciples, saying, Go your way into the 30
village over against *you*; in the which as ye enter ye shall
find a colt tied, whereon no man ever yet sat: loose him, and
bring him. And if any one ask you, Why do ye loose him? 31
thus shall ye say, The Lord hath need of him. And they that 32

to the many prophecies which speak of His power and greatness in war. Thus the next verse (Zech. ix. 10) reads: 'And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea and from the river even to the ends of the earth' (see notes by Professor Kennett in *Peake's Commentary*, p. 580). It seems very probable therefore that Jesus was led to enter Jerusalem in this particular way by the desire to fulfil this prophecy. How far He meant the Entry to be 'public' must remain doubtful: but in any case His object was to emphasise the spiritual and peaceful character of His Messiahship. On this view the 'Obtaining of the Colt' will, of course, be historical, but non-supernatural: Jesus had made His arrangements in advance. (Cp. for this view Lagrange, *Marc*, pp. 273–4; Rawlinson, *Mark*, p. 151; Warschauer, p. 246 f.)

29. Bethany 'was nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off' (John xi. 18). It has been identified with a modern village, east of Jerusalem. Bethphage, of which the name is said to mean 'House of (unripe) figs' (Bethany, 'House of dates?'), is unknown. Wright (*Luke*, p. 165) says: 'Possibly we should translate "Bethphage *or* Bethany," for in the sequel of all three narratives one village only figures, and it may well have borne both names.'

30. *the village over against you*: which, of the two mentioned above, is not clear.

There is some truth in Warschauer's words (p. 247): 'The description of the ass—"whereon no man ever yet sat"—' (cf. Num. xix. 2, 'The Lord hath commanded... bring thee a red heifer... upon which never came yoke'; Deut. xxi. 3 and 1 Sam. vi. 7, similar passages) 'is obviously legendary, as such an animal' (i.e. unbroken) 'would have made an unsafe and uncomfortable mount.' Plummer's note, 'It is no ordinary journey which He contemplates, but a royal progress.... The birth of a virgin and the burial in a new tomb are facts of the same kind,' though intended quite otherwise, serves to shew from what motives legend added the description.

31. *The Lord hath need of him.* If the narrative is historical, the animal will have belonged to a friend of Jesus in the village, who He knew would be ready to lend it on receipt of His message; or with whom He had previously made special arrangements to have it ready. The English translation of the message is misleading—the word 'lord' should be given its simpler pre-Christian sense here and in *v.* 34 below, and the sentence will mean 'The Master needs him.'

were sent went away, and found even as he had said unto
33 them. And as they were loosing the colt, the owners thereof
34 said unto them, Why loose ye the colt? And they said, The
35 Lord hath need of him. And they brought him to Jesus:
and they threw their garments upon the colt, and set Jesus
36 thereon. And as he went, they spread their garments in the
37 way. And as he was now drawing nigh, *even* at the descent
of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples
began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the
38 mighty works which they had seen; saying, Blessed *is* the
King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven,
39 and glory in the highest. And some of the Pharisees from
the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples.
40 And he answered and said, I tell you that, if these shall hold
their peace, the stones will cry out.

36. Cp. 2 Kings ix. 13: 'Then they hasted, and took every man his garment, and put it under him on the top of the stairs, and blew with trumpets, saying, "Jehu is king."' 'The road was carpeted as for a royal procession' (Easton).

38. *peace in heaven, and glory in the highest.* As Montefiore says, 'It is not easy to give to these words any precise meaning': 'such liturgical ejaculations should not be construed too closely' (Easton). Both parts of it may be taken as exclamations, i.e. 'Let there be peace in heaven' (cp. Job xxv. 2), i.e. no opposition to the will of God; 'and let there be glory (given to God) in heaven.' Or, taking the first as a statement, 'Peace is prepared in heaven by God to be given to men—may He who lives in heaven be glorified!' (Weiss).

39–40. THE PHARISEES' PROTEST

Peculiar to Luke

There may perhaps be some connection with Matt. xxi. 14–16 (the *children* crying out in the temple): McNeile (*Matt.* p. 301) suggests that possibly an Aramaic original lay behind both traditions in which 'children' and 'stones' were confused. Matthew's story is highly improbable (see McNeile, *ad loc.*), Luke's less so.

40. *the stones will cry out.* Cp. Habakkuk ii. 11, 'For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beetle out of the timber shall answer it.' If the incident is not historic, the words of Habakkuk and the desire to point the contrast of the Jewish unbelief against the loyal acclamations of the disciples may have combined to produce it.

And when he drew nigh, he saw the city and wept over it, 41
saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the 42
things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from
thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, when thine 43
enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee
round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee 44
to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall
not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou
knewest not the time of thy visitation.

41–44. JERUSALEM'S FATE

Luke only

This passage is largely founded on O.T. reminiscences (see notes below). There are two or three possibilities as to its origin. Many critics have considered it a *vaticinium post eventum* because of the rather definite way in which it describes the siege of Jerusalem. There is no clear evidence of this, however, for, as Taylor says (p. 123), 'Was it difficult for any one familiar with the social and political situation as it existed in our Lord's day to foresee the peril of the city?' And, granting the use of the O.T., such a passage as the present, of which the details are more or less characteristic of all sieges, might well have been produced *before* the event. If, however, on other grounds it is held that the Gospel was composed after A.D. 70 (cp. Streeter, p. 540), it is quite possible that the events of the siege may have influenced (or even inspired) the passage. That Jesus Himself should have foreseen and then lamented the city's fate is entirely natural (xiii. 34 note). But in this case the saying is in 'an impossible position; Wellhausen calls attention to its inconsistency with Christ's tone of exaltation immediately before and afterwards' (Easton). Yet to Creed (p. 241) 'the lament of Jesus over the city while He is surrounded by the shouting multitude makes a fine dramatic contrast.'

41. Lagrange says: 'After a few steps on the descent from the mount of Olives Jesus sees the city. Still to-day the sight is one of incomparable beauty. Then the Temple, scarcely finished, shone bright in the splendour of its white stones, surrounded by a girdle of very humble buildings and houses, which made a shadow on the sides of the hill like the blocks in a quarry' (p. 501).

42. *the things which belong unto peace*: 'the conditions—i.e. the relations with God—which make for thy peace' (Creed).

43. Isa. xxix. 3. 'And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a fort, and I will raise siege works against thee.'

44. *the time of thy visitation* means 'the time when God was testing thee.'

45 And he entered into the temple, and began to cast out
46 them that sold, saying unto them, It is written, And my

45–46. THE TEMPLE 'CLEARED'

Matt. xxi. 10–17; Mark xi. 11 *a*, 15–17

Luke considerably shortens Mark here—both by omitting Mark's statement that on the day of the Entry Jesus 'having looked round about upon all things, it being now late in the day, went out to Bethany with the Twelve' (Mark xi. 11 *b*) and came back on the next morning—probably the truth, for there is no point in invention; and also by cutting down the description of the event itself, presumably because he did not think his Gentile readers would be much interested in the Temple and its internal economy. [Mark's version is something of an anticlimax after the Triumphal Entry: indeed it confirms the view that whatever enthusiasm was then evinced was at least short-lived.]

It is not easy to determine exactly what happened in the Temple. The market in the outer court, or 'Court of the Gentiles,' was large, recognised, and necessary; here the various necessaries for sacrifices were sold, and provincial Jews could change their Greek and Roman coins for Jewish money wherewith to pay the Temple dues. For the condition of this market at the time of Jesus—about which much that is unfounded has been written by Christian commentators—one cannot do better than to quote the Jewish critic Montefiore, who is himself referring to Dr Abrahams' *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, vol. I, chap. xi: 'The "thieves" may refer to the cheating practised by sellers, or the reference may be more general: the Temple has become a meeting-place of scamps... Abrahams clearly proves that to suppose that the Temple had become an habitual den of thieves, and that there was constant "terrible desecration" going on, or that the money-changing was in itself illegitimate, or that all the priests were always rapacious is... unwarranted by the evidence. All we can say is that "certain rapacious priestly families were detested by the people *and by the Pharisees*," and that there might have "been occasions on which indignation such as that of Jesus" would have been justified' (vol. I, pp. 267–8).

The difficulty of the usually accepted view of Jesus' action was felt as long ago as in the time of Origen (c. A.D. 180–250) who 'thought that unless a miracle was to be postulated, the incident must be interpreted symbolically' (McNeile, *Matt.* p. 299). How did Jesus succeed in His extremely drastic protest: and how was it that no attempt at opposition seems to have been made, either by the stall keepers themselves, or by the Temple police? Luke (and Matthew), by the foreshortening of Mark noted above, give the impression that Jesus was, so to speak, at the head of the enthusiastic mob who had just acclaimed Him at His entry. But there is no trace of this in Mark's narrative. Moreover, such an outburst of 'mob law' could not possibly have been left unquelled by the authorities—nor indeed, one may add, could it have failed to be evidence, in fact the principal evidence, against Jesus at His trial. Those who hold that Jesus 'dominated the crowd of traffickers

house shall be a house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of robbers.

And he was teaching daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people sought to destroy him: and they could not find what they might do; for the people all hung upon him, listening.

47 48

by moral and not by physical means: they simply quailed before His holy indignation' (Rawlinson, p. 156) are merely adopting the first of Origen's alternatives. Loisy, naturally, adopts the second. The story is fictitious, built up on the O.T. (Zech. xiv. 21, 'and in that day there shall be no more a trafficker (Canaanite) in the house of the Lord of hosts': Malachi iii. 1 f., 'The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple....Who shall stand when He appeareth?...He shall purify the sons of Levi'). A way out may perhaps be found between these two extremes. It is very possible that, as in the manner of His entry into Jerusalem, Jesus Himself was influenced by the desire to fulfil such prophecies; and it is possible also that the incident in the Temple was not nearly so drastic or important as the Gospel story suggests. His protest, that is to say, was not successful enough, or on a large enough scale, to come to the attention of the authorities. But to Himself and His disciples its significance was deeply 'Messianic.'

Even so, the difficulty of obtaining witnesses against Jesus within a week afterwards is strange. This is the strongest point in favour of the chronology of the Fourth Gospel, which, as is well known, places this event at the beginning of Jesus' Ministry, more than two years before. In that case the lack of clear evidence would be natural enough. Moreover, since Mark only tells of one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem—that at the end of His life—he would have been forced to place the incident there. For arguments on both sides of this question—still an open one—see A. E. Brooke in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 307 f.; McNeile, *Matt.* p. 300; Warschauer, p. 256.

46. Isa. lvi. 7. Both Luke and Matthew omit the concluding words of the quotation given in Mark, 'for all the nations,' which have a special point since it is desecration of the Court of the Gentiles, the only part of the Temple where 'all nations' might pray, which is in question. Their reason is perhaps that they did not wish it to be suggested that at the time at which they were writing the Jewish Temple now destroyed was still the 'place of prayer for all nations.'

a den of robbers: Jer. vii. 11.

47–48. JESUS IN THE TEMPLE

Cp. Mark xi. 18–19, which however Luke rewrites very freely.

20 And it came to pass, on one of the days, as he was teaching
the people in the temple, and preaching the gospel, there
came upon him the chief priests and the scribes with the
2 elders; and they spake, saying unto him, Tell us: By what
authority doest thou these things? or who is he that gave
3 thee this authority? And he answered and said unto them,
4 I also will ask you a question; and tell me: The baptism of
5 John, was it from heaven, or from men? And they reasoned
with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he
6 will say, Why did ye not believe him? But if we shall say,
From men; all the people will stone us: for they be persuaded

XX. 1–8. BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

Mark xi. 27–33; Matt. xxi. 23–27

Luke omits Mark's account of the Fig Tree either because he dislikes it or because he has a somewhat similar section in xiii. 6–9.

2. *these things*: to what does this refer? In Mark, apparently, to the protest in the Temple: but, as Lagrange points out, this action would not be likely to arouse the resentment of the 'lay aristocracy of the Sanhedrin,' but only of the priests. Many Pharisees might have even approved it. [This will be especially true if the view of the incident taken above is correct.] It is therefore better to refer the word to Jesus' unauthorised teaching—the natural reference in view of the last verse. The Jewish leaders resent His whole attitude of opposition to themselves.

3. Jesus' counter-question is not merely a clever way of getting out of a difficulty, for it has a fundamental connection with that asked by the Jews. The argument is this: 'John's authority was the same as Mine: and if you are not prepared to admit that his authority came from God, because he taught what you did not like, you are not likely to accept My authority as from God.' The connection is all the closer on the view which sees in Jesus' Baptism by John the origin of Jesus' own consciousness of His Mission. It is thus perfectly natural and true to history that He should regard His own work as the completion of John's—His commission and John's the same.

4. *The baptism of John.* The phrase implies more than it says, i.e. John's life and work as a whole.

5. *Why did ye not believe him?* 'Luke almost certainly took "believe him" as "accept his testimony concerning Me," but the words could not have had this force to the Sanhedrists. The meaning was "accept his baptism"' (Easton).

6. *all the people etc.* This is Luke's paraphrase of Mark's somewhat abrupt phrase 'they feared the people.' There is some truth in McNeile's words: 'The fear of the people's anger is more easily understood if his' (John's) 'work were still in progress, and the country thrilled with the first enthusiasm about him' (*Matt.* p. 305).

that John was a prophet. And they answered, that they 7
knew not whence *it was*. And Jesus said unto them, Neither 8
tell I you by what authority I do these things.

7. The Jewish leaders play for safety. Plummer quotes Bede's scornful comment *Timentes lapidationem, sed magis timentes veritatis confessionem.*

9–19. THE HUSBANDMEN AND THE HEIR

Mark xii. 1–12; Matt. xxi. 33–46

Luke has a considerable number of variations from Mark, and in several points agrees with Matthew. It is possible therefore that the parable stood also in Q, or that Luke knew it in some other (? oral) form. But the agreements with Matthew may be mere coincidences, and the variations due to Luke's editing of Mark (see notes below).

The authenticity of the parable has often been denied. No definite decision can be made between the two views—that it is a genuine parable of Jesus, perhaps somewhat allegorised and adapted later in the light of after events: or that it is a symbolical sketch of Jesus' life and death written after His death at a time when anti-Jewish controversy was strong in the early Church. The arguments may be briefly stated thus:

A. Against its authenticity: (1) It is much more allegorical than most of Jesus' parables; thus the Householder is God, the vineyard the Jewish nation, the husbandmen the Jewish leaders, the servants the prophets, and the Heir Jesus. (2) The story itself is somewhat improbable—the action of the owner 'with each successive year becomes more quixotic,' the reasoning of the tenants is singularly futile. (3) It is unlikely that Jesus, even if He foresaw and spoke of His own death to the disciples, should have spoken thus openly of it to His opponents. Moreover, the claim to be Messiah is so clear—and apparently understood (*v.* 19)—that no other evidence against Him would have been needed.

B. For its authenticity: (1) There is no clear reason for supposing that Jesus may not occasionally have used allegory. Moreover, as has been suggested above, the parable may have been further allegorised later. It is clearly reminiscent of Isa. v. 2 (note on *v.* 9 below). Moreover, the absence of any reference to the Resurrection, and the fact that in the Marcan version (see note on *v.* 15) the details do not exactly fit the events of Jesus' death, is significant. A later Christian allegory would have resurrected the Heir, and been more exact. (2) One should not expect great logicality in a parable. The emphasis is on God's infinite patience; and the husbandmen's futile reasoning is parallel to the absurdity of the Jews' action in thinking that the best way for them to inherit God's Kingdom was to kill God's Messiah when He came. (3) If Jesus clearly foresaw His death, He may well have made this last appeal to His hearers' conscience by reminding them of God's patience and the threatenings of His justice.

9 And he began to speak unto the people this parable: A man
planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen, and went
10 into another country for a long time. And at the season he
sent unto the husbandmen a servant, that they should give
him of the fruit of the vineyard: but the husbandmen beat
11 him, and sent him away empty. And he sent yet another
servant: and him also they beat, and handled him shame-
12 fully, and sent him away empty. And he sent yet a third:
13 and him also they wounded, and cast him forth. And the
lord of the vineyard said, What shall I do? I will send my
14 beloved son: it may be they will reverence him. But when
the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned one with another,
saying, This is the heir: let us kill him, that the inheritance
15 may be ours. And they cast him forth out of the vineyard,
and killed him. What therefore will the lord of the vineyard
16 do unto them? He will come and destroy these husbandmen,
and will give the vineyard unto others. And when they heard

9. Luke considerably abbreviates Mark's account of the owner's operations, which are drawn from Isa. v. 1 f. Thus Mark (xii. 1) 'planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about it, and digged a place for the winefat, and built a tower': Isaiah 'My wellbeloved hath a vineyard...and he fenced it...and planted it...and built a tower... and also made a winepress therein.' Cp. also the rest of the passage, Isa. v. 1–7.

10. The rent is paid in kind.

13. It is true enough that, as Easton says, 'no man able to command force would risk a beloved son among such ruffians, especially as only a question of rental was at stake.'

14. The only justification for the inanity of the husbandmen's reasoning would be to suppose that they thought the owner dead. But it is probably meant to be inane.

15. Mark has 'And they took him, and killed him, and cast him forth out of the vineyard.' Both Matthew and Luke alter the order to suit the circumstances of Jesus' death, in that He was 'cast out of the vineyard' first, and then killed; i.e. led out of Jerusalem first, and then crucified (Heb. xiii. 12, 'Wherefore Jesus also...suffered without the gate').

16. If the parable was spoken by Jesus, 'give the vineyard to others' will to Him have meant that the outcast and despised Jews would inherit the Kingdom instead of their false leaders—the original husbandmen of the parable. If it is later, the husbandmen will have been the Jews as a whole, and 'others' Gentiles or Christians. Probably Luke took it thus.

it, they said, God forbid. But he looked upon them, and 17
said, What then is this that is written,

The stone which the builders rejected,
The same was made the head of the corner?

Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to 18
pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him
as dust.

And the scribes and the chief priests sought to lay hands 19
on him in that very hour; and they feared the people: for
they perceived that he spake this parable against them. And 20
they watched him, and sent forth spies, which feigned them-
selves to be righteous, that they might take hold of his speech,

17. Ps. cxviii. 22. The stone at the corner must be a large one capable of bearing firmly the double weight; one fit for this position might well be too large and unwieldy for use elsewhere. The 'Stone' is most naturally Jesus Himself (cp. Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 7): in that case the quotation was probably made after His death. If the words are taken as part of the parable and spoken by Jesus, the reference will be to the sinners whom the leaders despised; but this is less likely.

18. Not in Mark: probably to be omitted in Matthew. The verse is reminiscent of Isa. viii. 14, 'a stone of stumbling,' and Dan. ii. 34, 'a stone...brake them to pieces.' As a continuation of *v.* 17 the metaphors are extremely strained, for corner stones are not usually fallen upon, nor do they fall. The idea is the certainty that the stone will destroy its enemies utterly. It may be Luke's own commentary on the foregoing passage, or an early biblical gloss, in time introduced into the text.

20–26. TRIBUTE

Mark xii. 13–17; Matt. xxii. 15–22

20. Mark says shortly 'And they send to Him some of the Pharisees and Herodians to entrap Him in talk.' Luke rewrites this, at the same time dropping the reference to 'Herodians' as of little interest to his readers, emphasising the hypocrisy of the questioners and suggesting their motive. The subject of Luke's verb is the 'scribes and priests' of *v.* 19.

According to Mark, the question is the result of an 'unholy alliance' between the Pharisees—patriotic, anti-Roman, anti-tribute—and the Herodians—tolerant of Rome as the source of Herod's authority, and thus tolerant of the tribute. They sink their differences in their desire to discredit Jesus. The question of the 'tribute' (a 'poll-tax' paid by every adult in the Roman provinces) was a burning one in Judaea, for the payment of the tax was the symbol of subjection to the Roman rule. Jesus' questioners wanted Him to answer 'Yes' or 'No' to their question. If He said 'Yes, it is lawful to pay tribute' (as, in effect, He did), He would make Himself unpopular with the people. (It has

so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of
21 the governor. And they asked him, saying, Master, we know
that thou sayest and teachest rightly, and acceptest not the
22 person *of any*, but of a truth teachest the way of God: Is it
23 lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? But he
24 perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Shew me a

reasonably been suggested that His answer was, in fact, one of the reasons why there was later no popular movement on His behalf.) If He said 'No,' He could be denounced to Pilate as a preacher of sedition—'We have no king but Caesar.'

Of the Herodians, who are never mentioned by Luke, Lagrange says: 'It is questionable whether the Herodians were a sect of Herod's partisans. There were some of them in Galilee, when Herod the Great was not yet master of the country; but in the time of Jesus all the Galileans were Herod Antipas' subjects. These Herodians are probably therefore some influential Jews at the tetrarch's court, who naturally exhibited zeal for his house' (*Marc*, p. 55). According to the tradition which Luke preserves (xxiii. 6 f.), Herod was himself in Jerusalem at this time; the presence of some members of his court is therefore intelligible enough.

But there is some force in Warschauer's criticism that since 'the Pharisees hated the Romans precisely because they regarded the *census* as unlawful, and extremists among their number refused to pay it,' the supposition 'that they should have plotted to provoke Jesus into making a declaration which supported their contention, with a view to denouncing a sympathiser to the common enemy, is not so much to credit them with Machiavellianism as to suspect them of insanity' (p. 270). He suggests therefore that Luke is following a more reliable tradition when he ascribes the plot to the 'scribes and chief-priests,' the latter members of the anti-nationalist, pro-foreign Sadducean party. This may be the truth, but it is not likely that Luke was consciously correcting Mark here.

21. Flattery or sarcasm, or both. *acceptest not the person.* A Hebrew idiom, literally 'to receive a face': i.e. 'to judge by externals.'

22. *Cæsar*: Tiberius, A.D. 14–37.

23. '"Perceived their craftiness" is a natural comment, but it is a little unfortunate; Christ would have given the same answer to honest enquirers' (Easton).

24. *penny*: see xii. 6–7 note (*denarius*). Lagrange says: 'It cannot be proved that this was the amount of the tax. But it represented the Roman monetary unit. Herod had never had the right to strike silver coins. The Romans reserved this privilege for themselves. For current use they struck bronze coins; and, to spare the scruples of the Jews at seeing human portraits which had for them an idolatrous savour, these little local coins had emblems imprinted on them from the world of nature, ears of corn, palms, vine-leaves, or other objects. But the denarii, Roman money "par excellence," bore the Emperor's portrait.'

penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? And they said, Cæsar's. And he said unto them, Then render unto 25
Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things

The *image* might have been either that of Augustus or of Tiberius: the *superscription* his official titles.

25. This famous answer, the only saying of Jesus upon a directly political subject, has been as diversely interpreted as any words in the Gospels. It has sometimes been regarded as laying down the divine right of kings, sometimes as a clear assertion that the claim of the state is but secondary (cp. E. F. Scott, *Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, p. 76 f.). Sometimes the words have been taken to imply that the Church should have nothing to do with politics, sometimes in a directly contrary sense. In its interpretation the first essential is to remember that an isolated saying like this cannot *in itself alone* be made legitimately the foundation of any particular view of Jesus' attitude towards politics, much less of the Christian attitude to-day. It must first be interpreted in its original context and circumstances; then, with the foregoing limitation constantly in mind, we may attempt to estimate its bearing on Christian ethics.

The motives of Jesus' questioners have been suggested in the note on *v.* 20 above. The majority of recent commentators think that Jesus' own motive in His answer was primarily to avoid the dilemma contained in the question. Thus 'the answer was purposely non-committal. An attempt was made in the critical days at Jerusalem to force Jesus into a position that would compromise Him either with the Jewish people or with the Roman administration. He avoided the snare, while at the same time He lifted the whole issue to a higher plane' (Scott, p. 76). 'The Lord's answer is an evasion of the dilemma, except in so far as by it He makes it clear that He is no political revolutionary' (Rawlinson, p. 165). This view scarcely does Him justice. In that He did not simply answer 'Yes' or 'No' He may be said to have avoided the dilemma: but the effect of His answer was very definitely 'Yes' rather than 'No' (cp. *v.* 20 note): and the point of it lay not in the mere fact that the dilemma was evaded, but in the new line of thought which it suggested—a line of thought which itself indicated that the dilemma was false. Jesus appealed, it is true, to the view current in the ancient world that the image of the sovereign on a coin stamped it as his personal property; thus, coin which was Caesar's property should obviously to Caesar be repaid. But the thought behind the question had been that the rule of Caesar could not be reconciled with the rule of God; and Jesus' answer shews the falseness of this thought by implying that a man's duty to God does not in any way *exclude* his duty to his king. To pay to Caesar Caesar's dues was a necessary, if trivial, duty. 'Let men observe it without attaching greater importance to it than it possesses, and let them give their minds above everything to the essential duty, which is moral and religious duty' (Loisy). It is not who a man's king is that matters, but the life he leads.

26 that are God's. And they were not able to take hold of the saying before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace.

27 And there came to him certain of the Sadducees, they which say that there is no resurrection; and they asked him,

Thus Jesus' words went to the root of the political situation of His day. He must have foreseen the inevitable conclusion of the revolutionary unrest which the Zealots and the extremer Pharisees would never allow to die. Rome's patience would not last for ever. Moreover Rome's domination did not really matter very much. 'Instead of wasting themselves on political turmoil men ought to set their hearts with a new resolve on the Kingdom of God. By repentance and a life in harmony with His will, they might prevail on God to hasten the Kingdom, and then the conditions which they found so burdensome would at once be righted' (Scott, p. 79).

It will be evident therefore that an isolated saying, which is so closely related to the peculiar political circumstances of its own day, cannot be made the fount of any very definite modern theory of 'Church and State'; or of the propriety of political action on the Church's part. Jesus lived in a time of political crisis, and found it necessary Himself to keep clear of political action; but for modern times of comparative political quiescence Jesus' view of all life as sacramental of God may, in the present writer's opinion, be legitimately regarded as suggesting that there is no department of life, however remote, which it is not the Church's duty to enter.

27–40. THE AFTER-LIFE

Mark xii. 18–27; Matt. xxii. 23–33

27. *the Sadducees.* This is the only place in the Gospel where Luke mentions the Sadducees, though he speaks of them in Acts iv. 1, v. 17 and xxiii. 6–8. In the second of those passages he describes them as 'the high priest and all they that were with him (which is the sect of the Sadducees).' Of their characteristics Montefiore says: 'They were in a sense conservative. The letter of the Law was enough for them; they did not want the developments of the Rabbis. In doctrine too they were against innovation. Thus we hear that while they did not, apparently, deny Immortality they would have nothing to say to the doctrine of the Resurrection, in which we may nevertheless assert with confidence that eleven-twelfths of the nation already firmly believed. Many of these priests, and many of the nobles and "rulers," possessed, I should think, but a very formal and outward religion. We may compare them with many of the bishops, barons, and rulers of the middle ages' (*Syn. Gospels*, I, p. cii). They were sympathetic towards Greek culture: and politically tolerant of Rome.

For a full description of Jewish ideas about the resurrection, see Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. 'The litera-

saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, that if a man's brother 28
die, having a wife, and he be childless, his brother should
take the wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were 29
therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died 30
childless; and the second; and the third took her; and like- 31
wise the seven also left no children, and died. Afterward the 32
woman also died. In the resurrection therefore whose wife 33
of them shall she be? for the seven had her to wife. And 34
Jesus said unto them, The sons of this world marry, and are
given in marriage: but they that are accounted worthy to 35
attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead,

ture of the period preceding and following our Lord's appearance shews three views as to the future of the dead, viz. (1) the traditional doctrine of Sheol; (2) a doctrine, variously held, of resurrection; (3) a Platonic doctrine of immortality' (*HDCG*, art. 'Resurrection of the Dead'). The Sadducees held to the first of these views, which is that of most of the O.T.; life in Sheol was a shadowy counterpart of earthly life, in which the personality was dissolved. The view, popular in Jesus' day, of a bodily resurrection in the other world, grew up during the second and first centuries B.C., under the influence of persecution. God's justice must recompense the faithful for their sufferings. No doubt many of the more educated Pharisees held a more spiritual doctrine themselves: and it is frequently found in the apocalyptic literature. 'But,' as Easton says, 'the incident would not have occurred, and Christ's words would not have been so carefully preserved, if these educated Pharisees had impressed their opinion on the country at large.' He quotes two Rabbinic sayings, 'the women will bear children daily' and 'the woman who married two husbands will be restored to the first in the world to come.'

The Sadducees are quite sceptical of any such physical view, and in this question to Jesus they are trying to shew that it is absurd because it would involve such complications; at any rate it could not have been contemplated by the Law, which directed the marriage by a surviving brother of his dead brother's wife. Jesus' answer does not deny that if the after-life were physical, many such difficulties might arise. What He says is: 'The after-life is *not* necessarily physical, but spiritual; so your argument is off the point.'

28. Deut. xxv. 5–6. The Levirate law (Lat. *levir*, a husband's brother). If a man died without having a son, his brother was to marry the widow. If a son was then born, he (but not other children born later) was to have the name of the dead man, so that his family might not come to an end.

29. The example given is an extreme case, probably 'one of their stock arguments from Scripture against the resurrection' (Rawlinson).

35. Cp. xiv. 14 note, where Luke uses the phrase 'the resurrection of the just': here also he seems to contemplate a resurrection of 'the

36 neither marry, nor are given in marriage: for neither can
they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and
37 are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection. But that the
dead are raised, even Moses shewed, in *the place concerning*
the Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and
38 the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now he is not the
39 God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. And
certain of the scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well
40 said. For they durst not any more ask him any question.

just' prior to any universal resurrection. Mark has simply 'when they shall rise from the dead.'

36. *equal unto the angels.* 'Immortal' is the force of the phrase here, much the same, in fact, as that of the next clause. Marriage and procreation is a condition of mortality, which immortality may discard. 'Sons' inherit their parents' characteristics. Therefore sons of God or of the resurrection are themselves immortal. Of the latter phrase Easton says 'an intensely Hebraistic paraphrase for "because they rise."'

37 f. In these verses the point at issue is no longer the *nature* of the after-life, but the fact of its *existence*. The method of argument is the usual Jewish one of appeal to the letter of Scripture and has no force for modern minds, but there is a deeper thought behind. The argument is 'Long after Abraham and Isaac and Jacob had died, God said "I am their God." God is the God of living men, not dead. Therefore Abraham and Isaac and Jacob were still alive.' But behind this there is the thought that a man's relationship with God is something eternal, which is by its spiritual nature independent of death. God will not let His faithful perish.

37. *in the place concerning the Bush.* 'The Bush' is probably a title for the passage in Ex. iii which tells the story of God's appearance to Moses at the burning bush. So we might say, 'in the Gadarene Swine.'

38. *for all live unto him.* Added by Luke. Cp. Acts xvii. 28, 'for in him we live, and move, and have our being': Rom. xi. 36, 'for of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things.'

39–40. Luke leaves out here Mark xii. 28–34 (the Lawyer's Question) because he has already related it in x. 25 f. (cp. note there).

41–44. JESUS' QUESTION

Mark xii. 35–37; Matt. xxii. 41–46

This passage, which Luke takes over from Mark with practically no alteration, is not easy to interpret. It is based on the same attitude towards Scripture as the preceding argument from Exodus—here the proof text is from a Psalm. The use of such a method, however unconvincing to modern thought, need occasion no difficulty to those who are willing to admit the reality of Jesus' human nature. But it is not easy to decide quite what the argument is designed to prove.

And he said unto them, How say they that the Christ is 41
David's son? For David himself saith in the book of Psalms, 42
The Lord said unto my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand,

I. Assuming that the passage is authentic (the other view will be considered below) there are two main lines of interpretation: (A) Jesus knew that He was Messiah, and knew too that He was not of David's line. Therefore Messiah need not be 'son of David.' 'Jesus by His own manifestly authentic saying shatters the legend of His birth in Bethlehem, from the line of David.... He had probably once believed that the Messiah must be the son of David: now He knew that He was the Messiah, and not the son of David' (Middleton Murry, *Life of Jesus*, p. 258). Against this view it must be remembered that 'Mark, Luke and Matthew all transmit this saying in evident unconsciousness that it is in any way inconsistent with a Davidic descent of Christ. This tells very strongly against its ever having borne any such meaning' (Easton). Cp. i. 27, 'Joseph, of the house of David.' (B) 'Son of David' is used in a metaphorical sense—i.e. as inheriting the characteristics of David—and the argument refers to the *nature* of Jesus' Messiahship. Jesus urges upon His hearers that their view of Messiah, as so to speak, a 'super-David'—king and leader in war—was too narrow. Messiah is to be a spiritual leader—far more than merely a great and warlike king.

II. If the passage is not authentic, it has been regarded as having arisen either (A) as a 'protest on the part of the earliest community against the all too earthly Jewish Messianic ideal of the Son of David' (Weiss); or (B) 'in some Greek Christian community where it was believed that the Davidic sonship could be abandoned on the authority of Scripture, and to shew at the same time that the Lord Christ had no need to be the descendant of a king if a human descent was nevertheless attributed to Him' (Loisy).

None of these views is without difficulty. Perhaps I (B) is the best till new light dawns. The following note may be quoted as an example of the kind of interpretation which is happily far rarer than it used to be: 'Jesus... asserts here the great mystery of the Incarnation, the union of perfect humanity and perfect divinity foreshadowed in the ascription of the title "Lord" by David in the psalm to his Son. Such a question as this the Pharisees and Sadducees could not understand, much less answer' (!)

41. 'What of the common teaching that Messiah is to be of David's line?'

42. Ps. cx. 1. Jesus of course shared with His contemporaries the belief that David wrote the Psalms. Of this psalm Addis (*Peake's Commentary*) says: 'We may with some confidence refer it to 141 B.C., when Simon the Maccabee prince was accepted by the people as supreme Governor... and as High Priest.' Thus the original meaning of the quotation was 'Jehovah said to my lord (i.e. Simon) "I will give thee all dominion and victory."' Jesus' interpretation of the

43 Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.
44 David therefore calleth him Lord, and how is he his son?
45 And in the hearing of all the people he said unto his
46 disciples, Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love salutations in the marketplaces, and chief
47 seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater condemnation.
21 And he looked up, and saw the rich men that were casting

psalm as Messianic seems to be new. He takes 'my lord' of the Messiah, Himself.

44. 'If David himself calls Messiah his Lord, how can He be David's son, as the scribes say?' Fathers do not call their son 'Lord.' Easton says: 'Luke's understanding of the answer to the question is found in Acts ii. 25–36. The Messiah is descended from David, but is immeasurably exalted above him.'

45–47. THE SCRIBES' HYPOCRISY

Mark xii. 38–40

Cp. Matt. xxiii, in which Matthew collects Jesus' denunciation of the Jewish leaders into a long discourse: part of this Luke has given in ch. xi (notes there). For Jesus' denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees see especially xi. 52 note (last par.).

47. The exact sense in which 'devouring widows' houses' is to be understood is not quite clear. Perhaps some of the scribes took advantage of the piety of rich widows, and lived on their money. Their cruelty to the defenceless makes their prayers valueless. Others take the phrase as meaning that the scribes extracted 'rich fees for pious services': others that it refers more generally to the hypocrisy of 'public piety when coupled with private self-seeking.'

XXI. 1–4. THE WIDOW'S MITE

Mark xii. 41–44

This little scene presents a strong contrast with the subject of Jesus' denunciation at the end of ch. xx. (The chapter should obviously end at xxi. 4.) There scribes 'devouring widows' houses'—here a poor widow giving all she has. Presumably Mark—or earlier tradition—was influenced by this in his placing of the incident. It has been objected that it is hard to see how Jesus knew that she cast in 'two mites'—or that it was all she had. Here Warschauer's remarks are to the point: 'There is after all no particular difficulty in distinguishing rich and poor, nor did it require supernatural insight to surmise that the gifts of the former would be larger than that of an obviously poor woman: let the "two mites"...and the statement that this was all the living

their gifts into the treasury. And he saw a certain poor widow 2
casting in thither two mites. And he said, Of a truth I say 3
unto you, This poor widow cast in more than they all: for 4
all these did of their superfluity cast in unto the gifts: but
she of her want did cast in all the living that she had.

the widow had, be later embellishments—the lesson drawn from the incident as a whole, the emphasis on the spirit of giving rather than the amount of the gift, is thoroughly characteristic of the great Teacher' (p. 287).

1. *the treasury.* What exactly the Greek word denotes seems doubtful. It is usually taken to mean 'a box or chest to receive offerings'; and there is a Jewish tradition that there were thirteen such chests placed in the Temple for this purpose. But its normal use elsewhere seems to be rather in the sense of 'a room in which the Temple valuables were kept'; or the part of the Temple in which the boxes for offerings were kept—i.e. the Court of the Women. Cp. John viii. 20, 'These words spake he in the treasury.' It may quite naturally have borne both these meanings.

3–4. Montefiore says: 'The moral of the story is quite Rabbinic.' Cp. 2 Cor. viii. 12, 'For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.'

5–36. APOCALYPTIC

Mark xiii. 1–37; Matt. xxiv. 4–36

The view of this passage usually accepted has been that Luke has taken over with some freedom of revision the 'Little Apocalypse' which he found in Mark. (This 'Little Apocalypse' is held to be a Jewish apocalyptic document, edited by a Christian, and containing, or combined with, genuine sayings of Jesus on similar subjects—in circulation, and adopted by Mark, shortly before the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.) In Dr Vincent Taylor's book, however (*Behind the Third Gospel*), there is a full and interesting exposition (chap. IV) of the thesis that here, as often elsewhere, Luke is using another document as his primary, and Mark as his secondary, source. On this view *vv.* 12–15, 18–19, 20, 21 *b*, 22, 23 *b*–26 *a*, 28, 34–6 are mainly from Luke's other source; *vv.* 1–11, 16–17, 21 *a*, 23 *a*, 26 *b*–27, 29–33 are from Mark. Dr Taylor makes an excellent case.

There is much in this chapter which seems to express rather the thought and conditions prevailing in Judaea just before A.D. 70 than the actual words of Jesus. On the other hand 'the prediction of Jerusalem's fall, the anticipation of disaster and tribulation for His own people, the warning against anxiety whether in the presence of war or of persecution, the exhortation of watchfulness, clearly come from Jesus Himself' (H. G. Wood in *Peake's Commentary*). To these may be added a verse omitted by Luke (Mark xiii. 32), 'Of that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven nor the Son, only the Father'—a statement of the limitation of Jesus' knowledge

5 And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with
6 goodly stones and offerings, he said, As for these things
which ye behold, the days will come, in which there shall not
be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown
7 down. And they asked him, saying, Master, when therefore
shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign when these

which later Christian thought would never have invented. (See also Appendix I.)

5. Herod's Temple, begun in 20/19 B.C., and not yet finished in Jesus' day, 'is spoken of as exceedingly impressive in its grandeur. Its eastern front was covered with plates of gold, which threw back the rays of the rising sun, and formed an object of rare beauty for miles around. The stone of which it was built was white marble, and a large part of the side walls was covered with gold' (*HDB*, art. 'Temple'). Cp. xix. 41 note.

6. Some have regarded this prophecy of the Temple's destruction as merely part of the following description. 'Jesus was not foreseeing . . . the destruction of Jerusalem by the legionaries of Titus. He was describing the Last Things—that final moment of chaos which should accompany His own advent as Messiah: . . . of which the overthrow of the great Temple was but a single part' (Middleton Murry, *Life of Jesus*, p. 260).

It is, on the other hand, natural (and, in view of other passages, more probable) that Jesus should, on other grounds, have foreseen and lamented the coming fate of the city of Jerusalem; not through supernatural perception but by keen observation of the trend of the political situation of His day. Rome's patience would not last for ever. Sooner or later the lion's tail would flick away the insect that disturbed its peace. Cp. notes on xiii. 34 f.; and (especially) xix. 41–44. To what is said there may be added that Jesus' insistence on the spiritual nature of religion may have led Him to follow in the steps of Micah and Jeremiah in prophesying the Temple's destruction (Micah iii. 12, 'Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps'; Jer. xxvi. 6, 'Then will I make this house like Shiloh, and will make this city a curse to all the nations of the earth,' and *v.* 18). 'It is in accordance with His prophetic character that Jesus should predict the destruction of the Temple. It is also in accordance with the spiritual character of His religion. It is also a mark of His originality, and of His elevation above the religious level of His age. For though it is exaggeration to say that the Jews believed that God lived in the Temple and not elsewhere, or that the presence of God among His people was conditioned by the existence of the Temple, the old ideas did still hang about men's minds; and the continuance of the religion apart from the Temple, and all the better for its loss, was hard to conceive' (Montefiore, I, p. 296).

7. If this question was actually addressed to Jesus by His disciples —and it is very probable that it was—no doubt His real answer is

things are about to come to pass? And he said, Take heed 8
that ye be not led astray: for many shall come in my name,
saying, I am *he*; and, The time is at hand: go ye not after
them. And when ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not 9
terrified: for these things must needs come to pass first; but
the end is not immediately.

Then said he unto them, Nation shall rise against nation, 10
and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be great 11
earthquakes, and in divers places famines and pestilences;
and there shall be terrors and great signs from heaven. But 12
before all these things, they shall lay their hands on you, and
shall persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and
prisons, bringing you before kings and governors for my
name's sake. It shall turn unto you for a testimony. Settle 13,14
it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate beforehand how
to answer: for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all 15
your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or to gainsay.
But ye shall be delivered up even by parents, and brethren, 16
and kinsfolk, and friends; and *some* of you shall they cause

expressed in Mark xiii. 32 (a verse omitted by Luke), 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' What follows here refers to the Parousia—the coming of the Son of Man and the 'End'—and does not answer the question about the Temple except in so far as the lesser is included in the greater.

8–11. Not only are the events described here—false Messiahs, wars and revolts, earthquakes and other unnatural phenomena—familiar features of Jewish apocalyptic (cp. Latimer Jackson, *Eschatology of Jesus*, chap. IV), but they may perhaps be held to suit the circumstances of the time at which this apocalyptic document itself was written: e.g. 'In A.D. 61 there had been a severe earthquake in Phrygia, which had done vast damage . . . in 63 an eruption of Vesuvius had laid half Pompeii in ruins; there had been famines in the reigns both of Claudius and Nero; the Jewish rebellion against Rome, and the war which led to the capture and destruction of Jerusalem, had begun, or was about to begin, in A.D. 66' (Warschauer, p. 289).

12–19. Here Luke diverges considerably from Mark: cp. note above at beginning of section. Persecution will be part of the presaging of the End. Luke's version is more optimistic and courageous than Mark's—e.g. *vv.* 13, 15, 18: perhaps in the light of Christian experience.

13. '(Welcome it, for) it will give you an opportunity of delivering your message.'

16–17. Apocalyptic sees everything going from bad to worse before the great revival. Family loyalties have no meaning now. Cp. Matt.

17 to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my
18 name's sake. And not a hair of your head shall perish.
19 In your patience ye shall win your souls.
20 But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then
21 know that her desolation is at hand. Then let them that are
in Judæa flee unto the mountains; and let them that are in
the midst of her depart out; and let not them that are in the
22 country enter therein. For these are days of vengeance, that
23 all things which are written may be fulfilled. Woe unto them
that are with child and to them that give suck in those days!

x. 21; and Micah vii. 6, 'The son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter in law against her mother in law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house.'

18. This is another version of xii. 7, 'But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.' In the context here the saying *may* be meant literally—in which case the Greek word in the next verse will be translated 'lives' instead of 'souls': 'In spite of treachery and the deaths of the martyrs' (or 'of some few of you already'), 'you' (the writer's own generation) 'shall be preserved: by courageous endurance you shall save your lives.' But it is much more natural to take it spiritually: 'Even if you are betrayed and put to death you can come to no real harm. Be brave and endure, and so you shall win eternal life.' Lagrange suggests that Luke was thinking of the recovery by martyred Christians at the Resurrection of their earthly bodies with every hair complete!

20–24. The Fate of Jerusalem. Only in two verses is Luke close to Mark here: 21 *a* and 23 *a* (=Mark xiii. 14 *b* and 17).

20. Luke's divergence from Mark here is well known. Mark has 'When you see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not'—a cryptic phrase from Daniel referring to some future event. If it is held that Mark is Luke's primary source throughout this chapter, and that Luke's divergences here are due simply to his editorial revision of Mark, this verse will be clear evidence that Luke is writing *after* the fall of Jerusalem, and adapts Mark in the light of experience. Many critics regard this as certain: e.g. Stanton (*Gospels as Hist. Doc.* II, p. 275) and Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 540). If, on the other hand, it is held, with Taylor (see note at beginning of section) and Easton (p. 312), that Mark is merely a secondary source for Luke here, there seems no reason why the account which Luke is mainly deriving from some other source should not be an independent apocalyptic—perhaps written just before A.D. 70, when the siege was about to begin—or a good deal earlier, for its form is vague enough not to demand a background of actual events.

22. *all things which are written.* Prophetic denunciations of the city, very frequent in the O.T. Cp. *v.* 6 above, note.

23. I.e. those who cannot take to flight.

for there shall be great distress upon the land, and wrath
unto this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the 24
sword, and shall be led captive into all the nations: and
Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the
times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And there shall be signs 25
in sun and moon and stars; and upon the earth distress of
nations, in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the
billows; men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the 26
things which are coming on the world: for the powers of the
heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son 27
of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. But 28
when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift
up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh.

And he spake to them a parable: Behold the fig tree, and 29
all the trees: when they now shoot forth, ye see it and know 30
of your own selves that the summer is now nigh. Even so ye 31
also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that
the kingdom of God is nigh. Verily I say unto you, This 32
generation shall not pass away, till all things be accomplished.

24. *the times of the Gentiles.* Either (*a*) times when the Gentiles possess the privileges forfeited by the Jews; or (*b*) much more usually, the times of domination by the godless heathen, which apocalyptic conceived as necessarily to be passed through before the End. 'An apocalyptic catch-word: the period set for the Roman Empire' (Grieve in *Peake's Commentary*). It is clear that Luke would not himself have used the phrase in this sense—'that of simple hate' (Easton)—perhaps he understood it (if it comes from his source) in the other sense.

25–28. The End. 'Convulsions of the heavenly bodies, normally so unerring in obedience to God's laws, were a standing feature of Hebrew eschatology; see Isa. xiii. 10, xxiv. 19, 20, 23, xxxiv. 4; Jer. iv. 23, etc. etc.' (McNeile, *Matt.* p. 352).

29–33. The fig tree. From Mark xiii. 28 f.

29. *and all the trees.* Luke adds this phrase: any tree will do to illustrate the lesson.

32. This saying, Mark xiii. 30, which purports to state that the 'End' will come within the lifetime of Jesus' contemporaries, is difficult to reconcile with the saying which appears two verses later in Mark, 'But about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, only the Father': a saying which Luke omitted, on grounds of reverence, because it seemed to limit 'the Son's' knowledge; the fact that it does so is, on the other hand, the strongest evidence for its authenticity, for no early Christian would have so invented it. Unless, therefore, *v* 30 (in Mark) is understood to mean that the End *will* be before very long, although—*v.* 32 (in Mark)—the

33 Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not
pass away.
34 But take heed to yourselves, lest haply your hearts be
overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of
35 this life, and that day come on you suddenly as a snare: for
so shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of all
36 the earth. But watch ye at every season, making supplica-
tion, that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall
come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.
37 And every day he was teaching in the temple; and every
night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called
38 *the mount* of Olives. And all the people came early in the
morning to him in the temple, to hear him.
22 Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is
2 called the Passover. And the chief priests and the scribes

exact time is only known to God, it is better to regard the prediction as the product of Jewish apocalyptic. In any case 'it is impossible to escape the conclusion that Christ as Man expected the End within the lifetime of His contemporaries' (McNeile, *Matt.* p. 355).

34–36. An Exhortation to Watchfulness.

36. For the modern reader this verse, with its exhortation to loyalty towards ideals in the face of suffering, and its conviction that only so can a man face his Judge without flinching, is the message of apocalyptic in a nutshell.

37–38. JESUS AT JERUSALEM

An introduction to the next section: apparently a different tradition from that in Mark xi. 11, 19, which represents Jesus as spending the nights at Bethany.

Here some MSS insert the 'Woman taken in Adultery' from John vii. 53–viii. 11.

XXII. 1–6. THE PRIESTS AND JUDAS

Mark xiv. 1–2 and 10–11 (Luke omits Mark xiv. 3–9, presumably because he has already told the story of an Anointing in vii. 36 f.; see notes there for the relation of that story to the Marcan one): Matt. xxvi. 1–5, 14–16.

1. *the feast of unleavened bread . . . which is called the Passover.* Mark 'the passover and the unleavened bread,' which is more strictly correct, for the Passover day, the 14th of the Jewish month Nisan, was immediately followed by the festival of the Unleavened Bread (Nisan 15th–21st). But the two festivals were (and are by modern Jews, says Montefiore) treated as one.

sought how they might put him to death; for they feared the people.

And Satan entered into Judas who was called Iscariot, 3
being of the number of the twelve. And he went away, and 4
communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might deliver him unto them. And they were glad, and covenanted 5

2. *for they feared the people.* Mark has 'For they said, "Not on the festival, lest there be an uproar among the people."' Luke omits this because, according to the tradition which he and the other Synoptists follow, Jesus *was* crucified on the festival (for this see note on *v.* 7 below). At the time of the festival the city would be full of pilgrims from Galilee and elsewhere, and there would be many who knew and admired Jesus. Thus any attempt to arrest Him openly might be followed by a disturbance. This fact explains why Jesus was not arrested when He was teaching each day in the Temple (cp. xxi. 38 above).

3. *And Satan entered into Judas.* In this and the three following verses Luke is considerably fuller than Mark. The present phrase is one of several which he adds. It affords an interesting parallel to John xiii. 27, 'Satan entered into him.' 'Judas's act is regarded as only explicable through the direct instigation of the devil' (Montefiore). A full discussion of the contacts between Luke and John in the Passion story will be found in Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, p. 401 f. His conclusion is that it is 'difficult to deny some literary connection between Luke and John,' i.e. that John used Luke or one of Luke's sources. Apart from larger matters such as their treatment of references to Martha and Mary, their versions of the Anointing, and their agreement that the first Resurrection Appearance of Jesus took place in Jerusalem and not (as in Matthew and Mark) in Galilee, Streeter points out several indications of more direct literary dependence: 'The observation that Judas's offer to the high priests to betray Jesus was a direct suggestion of the devil; Pilate's *three times* repeated formula "I find no fault in Him" (Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22); the detail that it was the *right* ear of the high priest's servant that was cut off (Luke xxii. 50; John xviii. 10); the point that the tomb was one "in which no one had ever yet been laid"; the statement that *two* angels—not *one*, as in Mark and Matthew—were seen by the women at the tomb' (p. 404).

4. *captains*, only mentioned by Luke. 'The officers of the Temple police, a numerous body composed chiefly of Levites. As these functionaries were responsible for all arrests, it devolved on them to negotiate with Judas' (Easton). The most probable explanation of Judas' motive in betraying Jesus is disappointment and resentment. He had found Jesus not such a Messiah as he longed for—unable or unwilling to free the people from the Roman yoke—an impostor or a dreamer—and so he determined to effect His death.

5. *were glad*, because Judas' offer was an unexpected and convenient way out of their difficulty.

6 to give him money. And he consented, and sought oppor-
tunity to deliver him unto them in the absence of the multi-
tude.

7 And the day of unleavened bread came, on which the

6. Luke interprets Mark's 'conveniently' more explicitly by *in the absence of the multitude*, i.e. when the crowds should not be with Him. This explanation of Judas' 'betrayal,' i.e. that he gave the priests an opportunity of arresting Jesus 'on the quiet' by telling them of His whereabouts after dark, has been widely adopted since Luke's time. It is probably the best and simplest. Some object that the priests could have easily discovered Jesus' whereabouts for themselves, for He was already well known. But, as Montefiore says, 'perhaps Jesus changed His night quarters on purpose. He may have suspected what was planned. To know where He would be on any particular night, some espionage or treachery was necessary' (I, p. 320). Moreover, the priests wished to get the arrest over, and Jesus out of the way, before the festival. To shadow and spy on Him, and then make the necessary arrangements for arresting Him, would take time. Judas' way was quick and simple. Those who, like Schweitzer, make the keeping of a 'Messianic secret' the centre of their estimate of Jesus, believe that it was this which Judas betrayed (cp. Warschauer, p. 297): when the Gospels were written it was thought that Jesus had 'assumed the messianic *rôle* openly'; thus the clue to the betrayal was lost. For the inconsistencies of this view, see Rawlinson, p. 258 f.; Emmet, *The Eschatologica lQuestion in the Gospels*, p. 26 f. and p. 46 f.; Sanday, *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 74 f.

7–13. PREPARATIONS FOR THE PASSOVER

Mark xiv. 12–16; Matt. xxvi. 17–19

7. There is a well-known chronological discrepancy between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel with regard to the closing events of Jesus' life. It is clear that Jesus died on a Friday (Mark xv. 42). According to the Synoptists (Luke follows Mark closely in this verse) the Friday on which Jesus was crucified was the first day of the festival of Unleavened Bread (see note on *v.* 1 above), i.e. Nisan 15. (It must be remembered that Jewish days were reckoned from sunset to sunset: i.e. Nisan 15 would, if a Friday, begin at sunset on what we should call Thursday evening.) The Last Supper will thus correspond with the Passover meal itself, eaten on Thursday evening; i.e. the evening when Nisan 14 ended and Nisan 15 began. According to the Fourth Gospel the Friday was Nisan 14, the 'Preparation' for the Passover, when the Passover lambs were killed 'towards sunset': thus Jesus' death would take place about the time when the lambs were being killed. The Last Supper was not then the Passover, but took place on the evening before, the evening when Nisan 13 ended and Nisan 14 began.

passover must be sacrificed. And he sent Peter and John, 8
saying, Go and make ready for us the passover, that we may
eat. And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we make 9
ready? And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered 10

A full discussion of the point, together with accounts of recent attempts to harmonise the discrepancy, will be found in Montefiore, 1, p. 307 f.; Rawlinson, p. 262 f.; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 330 f. It may be said briefly here that the trend of modern criticism has been strongly in favour of the Johannine arrangement, for the following main reasons: (1) The Last Supper does not appear to resemble the Passover meal (see further below). (2) 'That the trial should have been held upon the first night of the festival would have been a flagrant violation of Jewish law. That the Romans would have crucified Jewish criminals upon the first day of Passover is extremely unlikely' (Montefiore). Moreover the authorities had expressly determined to arrest Jesus *before* the festival (note on *v.* 2 above). Cp. how in Acts xii Herod waits till the festival is over before killing Peter. (3) The cumulative weight of several smaller points: e.g. 'the visit to Gethsemane (see Ex. xii. 22), also the bearing of arms...the purchase of linen cloth for the entombment, and the actual burial by Jewish hands, all of which things...would be out of keeping with the character of a day which according to Ex. xii. 16 was to be regarded...as the equivalent of a Sabbath' (Rawlinson, p. 263).

If then the Johannine view is accepted, the Synoptic tradition will be regarded as due to the desire of early Christians to identify the 'Last Supper' with the Passover, i.e. to shew that the Christian Eucharist was the true fulfilment of the Jewish rite. (Cp. also note on *v.* 15 below.) The point is an important one, not only because it bears upon the nature of the Last Supper and the significance of many other incidents in the Passion story, but also for its relation to the question of the historical value of the Fourth Gospel. In what follows the Johannine chronology will be accepted as correct.

As has been said above, the Passover lambs were killed on the afternoon of the day on which, at sunset, the first day of the festival of Unleavened Bread began. Thus, by the strictly Jewish reckoning, the two halves of this verse do not refer to the same 'day,' and it is illogical. But Mark, whom Luke follows, writes from the Gentile point of view, and naturally speaks of the afternoon and evening as one day.

8. *Peter and John*: the names are given only by Luke (Mark simply, 'two of His disciples'), either from independent tradition or because they were so prominent later (Acts iii, iv, viii, etc.).

Besides arranging about a room—in this case, apparently, already secured—the preparations would include the provision of the lamb, killed at the Temple, bitter herbs, unleavened bread, etc. If the Last Supper was not the Passover, either these verses are a traditional addition, or the disciples were preparing for the Passover on the evening of the next day; Jesus had intended to eat it with them but Judas' action forestalled Him (cp. *v.* 15 below).

into the city, there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher
11 of water; follow him into the house whereinto he goeth. And
ye shall say unto the goodman of the house, The Master saith
unto thee, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the
12 passover with my disciples? And he will shew you a large
13 upper room furnished: there make ready. And they went,
and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready
the passover.
14 And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the
15 apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I
have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:

10 f. To the Evangelists these instructions no doubt seemed supernatural: cp. the provision of the colt for the Entry. But, as Easton says, 'the narrative itself suggests rather a carefully arranged plan to conceal His movements from all but a trusted few.' Jesus may have made arrangements for a room with one of His friends in Jerusalem, and the servant with the water pot was to be sent to take the disciples to the house.

12. *furnished*, i.e. with rugs and cushions, for reclining.

14–23. THE LAST SUPPER

Cp. Mark xiv. 17–25; Matt. xxvi. 20–29; 1 Cor. xi. 23–25

From this point to the end of the Gospel Luke seems to be largely independent of Mark. Not only does he introduce much that is peculiar to himself, but when he is telling the same stories as Mark he differs from him both in language and arrangement. On Streeter's theory the section is thus derived from Proto-Luke, with some isolated verses of Mark inserted (p. 216).

15. *With desire I have desired.* The repetition by a noun of the idea of the verb is a Hebrew method of expressing emphasis, cp. Mark vii. 10, 'let him die the death.' Thus, 'I earnestly desired....'

This verse is capable of two quite different interpretations, according to whether the Last Supper is held to have been the Passover or not. If it is, they express 'profound relief; Christ knew that His death was certain and had feared that He might be arrested before the Passover' (Easton). So most commentators—and no doubt so Luke himself, who believed that the Supper was the Passover. Creed, in fact, thinks that Luke wrote the saying himself, on the basis of Mark xiv. 25, to underline this view. But Professors Brooke and Burkitt suggest that it means just the opposite—that Jesus had much desired to eat the Passover again with His disciples, but saw now that He would not be able to do so: His next Passover would be the Messianic feast (*J.T.S.* July 1908, p. 569). 'The words in Luke...suggest, though they do not quite compel, the view that *in his source* the Last Supper was conceived as taking place on the day before the Passover,' i.e. in

for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the 16
kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and when he had 17
given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among your-
selves: for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth 18

agreement with John. 'If so, Luke, in conflating his special source with Mark, has misunderstood and obscured its original purport' (Streeter, p. 423).

16. Such an interpretation as this, 'The Passover of which Christ will partake... is the Christian Eucharist, in which He joins with the faithful in the Kingdom of God on earth,' throws overboard all sense of history. 'The conception of the Passover,' says Easton, 'as a type of the coming Kingdom is common in Jewish literature, whether with or without specific reference to the Messianic Banquet.'

17–20. Two closely connected questions arise at this point. What is the true text? Is the description here suggestive of the Passover? The textual facts are these: some MSS omit the second half of 19 (from after 'my body'), and the whole of 20: two other MSS also have this omission, but go further by putting the first half of 19 after 16. Two MSS of the Syriac version do the same, but supplement the first half of 19 by some words from Paul's account in 1 Cor. xi. Another MS of the Syriac omits 17–18, but includes all 19 and 20.

1. If the full text is accepted as original, it will at once be observed that Luke mentions *two* cups. This can only be explained by taking the first cup either as one of the four cups drunk at the Passover—if the meal is the Passover; or as Jesus' substitute for, or anticipation of, the Passover He had hoped to be able to celebrate with the Twelve. '*Vv.* 15–17 contain words spoken at the beginning of the meal (which may be paraphrased thus: "I earnestly longed to eat this year's Passover with you before My death, for I shall not celebrate another until I feast with you in the Kingdom of God. But let us at least join in a last act of fellowship; divide this cup among you"); *vv.* 19, 20... describe the Eucharistic act at the *end* of the meal; and in *v.* 18 the Lord closed as He began, with a prediction that His next feast would be in the Kingdom of God, but a scribe, in order to produce an immediate parallelism, transferred it to its present position with a connecting "for"' (McNeile, *Matt.* pp. 385–6). In this case 'the textual confusion is due to the strange action of scribes who, finding two cups, retained the first to the exclusion of the second.'

2. But one cannot help feeling that in view of the simultaneous existence not only of Matt., Mark and 1 Cor. but also of the practice of the Christian Eucharist, such action is too 'strange' even for the proverbial folly of scribes. If the text which omits the second half of 19, and the whole of 20, is the original, the variants can be satisfactorily explained as successive stages of harmonisation with the other accounts, either by altering the order 'cup-bread' to 'bread-cup' and supplementing, or by omitting the first cup. It is therefore best to accept this text. In this case two interpretations are possible: (*a*) that the cup is a Passover cup: Luke's account of the Eucharist

of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.
19 And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake
it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given
20 for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like
manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant

included the bread only. This is 'to be explained from liturgical practice. "The breaking of bread" in the Palestinian church was celebrated with extreme frequency, or even daily (Acts ii. 46), by small house-groups. Under such circumstances wine must often have been unobtainable, for it was so expensive that the Mishnah describes the sacrifice a poor man might have to make to obtain the small quantity needed for the Passover. A custom of Eucharists without wine would have been inevitable under such circumstances, a custom that would be certain to lead to the belief that the original Eucharist was wineless' (Easton, p. 323). This is entirely conjectural. (*b*) That Luke's account inverts the order of the Institution: the cup in *v.* 17 is the Eucharist cup. In support of this are quoted a passage from the *Didache* ('Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' a first-century document *c.* A.D. 80–100), section 9–10; and 1 Cor. x. 16, in both of which passages the cup is mentioned before the bread. This suggests that the Eucharist may have been celebrated in that order in some sections of the primitive Church. This seems the best interpretation.

3. Some would omit the whole of *vv.* 19 and 20. In this case 'Luke's account of the supper identifies it with the Passover, and makes it purely historical. The liturgical rite was added on with words borrowed from Paul.' The quotation is from Montefiore (II, p. 590), though he does not adopt the theory. As he says, it is highly improbable that Jesus did *nothing* at all distinctive at this last meal, and that all the Eucharistic practice and tradition arose entirely without the foundation of the words 'This is My body'—'This is My blood.' Moreover, there is *no* textual evidence for the omission of the first part of *v.* 19: and Luke is unlikely to have omitted Mark's reference to the bread.

It will be apparent that the question 'Does the description suggest the Passover?' is partially at any rate dependent upon the solution of the problem discussed above. It may, however, be useful to give a short description of the Passover meal, and then to leave the reader to judge for himself. 'A cup of red wine, mixed with water, was poured out for each guest . . . and over it a blessing was spoken. . . . The Paschal table, with its appropriate viands, was then placed in position. These comprised the lamb, the bitter herbs . . . and the *harōseth*, a paste of dates, raisins, etc., with vinegar, which was held to represent the mortar of Egypt, and salt water. The president of the company took some of the bitter herbs, dipped them in salt water, ate a portion the size of an olive, and gave a similar portion to his companions. A second cup of wine was now poured out. . . . After this the president explained the significance of the feast. . . . The first part of the Hallel (Pss. cxiii, cxiv) was sung, and the second cup of wine drunk. . . . One

in my blood, *even* that which is poured out for you. But 21
behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on
the table. For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been 22
determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is
betrayed! And they began to question among themselves, 23
which of them it was that should do this thing.

of the two unleavened cakes was broken, and pieces containing between them bitter herbs were, after dipping in the *harōseth*, handed to each one....After this the Paschal lamb was eaten, a third cup of wine filled, a blessing said and the cup drunk....There remained another cup to be drunk...the second part of the Hallel (Pss. cxv–cxviii) was sung; and the feast ended with a benediction' (*HDCG*, art. 'Passover'). Cp. a little book called *The Last Supper*, by Professor R. H. Kennett (Heffer, 1921).

This is not the place to discuss the theological significance of the passage, or to enter into the controversies that have centred upon it. Two things may, however, be briefly said. It is clear that the words 'this do in remembrance of Me' cannot with any degree of certainty be regarded as part of the original text of any of our Gospels: while it must remain an open question whether Paul's use of them in 1 Cor. xi. 24 is due to independent tradition or to interpretation of the Church's practice. There is therefore but slender direct evidence on which to defend the view that at the Last Supper Jesus definitely, by His own command, instituted a rite for the future. But, as Dr Rawlinson says, 'it need not be doubted that the Eucharist historically arose out of what the Lord did and said at the Last Supper, or that the Church in perpetuating it was rightly interpreting His will' (p. 204). Clear and candid discussions on this point will be found in an article 'Sacraments and the Synoptic Gospels' by Dr Douglas White in the *Modern Churchman* for Oct. 1926; and in *Should such a Faith Offend?* (paper, 'The Eucharist') by E. W. Barnes (Hodder and Stoughton, 1927).

For it was perfectly natural that Jesus' disciples should have commemorated at their own common meals the ideas, invested as they had been with a special poignancy by the sequel, which Jesus' action at their last meal together had suggested. The thanksgiving over the meal was habitual as in any Jewish household. With Jesus it had clearly become specially characteristic ('He was known of them in the breaking of the bread,' Luke xxiv. 35). On that last night before He died He had stood before them with the loaf in His hands, blessed, and brake: and they had all eaten. They found two ideas in the memory: the closeness of their fellowship with Him, which was not to be interrupted by His death; and the meaning of His own life and death—complete self-giving for the sake of others. Despite all diversity of ritual, and despite all controversy, these are the same two root ideas which Christians of all Churches find and treasure in their commemoration of the Last Supper.

23. Here there is no allusion to, or suspicion of, Judas: contrast Matt. xxvi. 25, an obviously less original version than that of Luke or Mark.

24 And there arose also a contention among them, which of
25 them is accounted to be greatest. And he said unto them,
The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they
26 that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But
ye *shall* not *be* so: but he that is the greater among you, let
him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that
27 doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat,
or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am
28 in the midst of you as he that serveth. But ye are they which
29 have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint
unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me,
30 that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and
ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

24–27. GREATNESS

Cp. Mark x. 42–45; Matt. xx. 25–28

Luke introduces here, as Jesus' reply to a dispute for precedence among the disciples, the teaching on Humility and Service which in Mark and Matthew is occasioned by the request of James and John for high place in the Kingdom—an incident omitted by Luke. The context seems unsuitable: perhaps Luke put the passage here on account of *v.* 27, 'I am among you as he that serves,' either as a concluding epitaph, so to speak, upon Jesus' whole life and work; or because Luke knew of the tradition preserved in John xiii. 4–17 (Jesus washes the disciples' feet), of which the verse sums up the moral.

25–27. 'In the world greatness means power and titles of respect; among you greatness must mean service. I am your leader, yet I have always served you all.'

28–30. THE APOSTLES' FUTURE

Cp. Matt. xix. 28. Not in Mark

28. *in my temptations*, i.e. in the difficulties and disappointments of His Ministry, with its opposition and misunderstanding.

29–30. The language and thought of the saying is narrowly Jewish and apocalyptic; and in its present form 'the wording is open to suspicion. "My Kingdom" does not sound like words of the historic Jesus. But we may assume that Jesus did make a promise, or held out a hope, of this kind to the Twelve to be fulfilled at the accomplishment of the Kingdom' (Montefiore, II, p. 599). A remark by Rashdall is to the point: 'I doubt whether our Lord promised the disciples that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. How could He who made such a promise have declared that to sit on His right hand and on His left was not His to give?' (*Conscience and Christ*, p. 51).

Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he 31
might sift you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, 32
that thy faith fail not: and do thou, when once thou hast
turned again, stablish thy brethren. And he said unto him, 33
Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death.
And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this 34
day, until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.

31–34. PETER'S CONFIDENCE

31, 32 peculiar to Luke: for 33, 34 cp. Mark xiv. 29, 30; Matt. xxvi. 33, 34

31–32. Jesus predicts a time of trial for the Apostles. Satan has asked for (and obtained) permission to test them severely. The words imply Mark xiv. 50, 'They all forsook Him and fled,' which does not appear in Luke. But Peter's failure will be only for a time, and then he is to restore the faith of the others.

As these verses stand they suggest by their wording reflection upon the past rather than prediction. They support the view both of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5, 'He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve'), and of Luke's special source (xxiv. 34), that Peter was 'the founder of the resurrection faith' (Bacon). Easton points out the contacts with John: 'the prediction of the denial is placed at the supper (against Mark, while Luke's wording is more like John xiii. 38 than Mark xiv. 30); and with *v.* 32 *b* cp. John xxi. 16–18' (Jesus' farewell to Peter) (p. 327). But there may lie behind the verses an authentic memory of a prayer of Jesus, apparently unfulfilled, that if all failed Peter might be strong.

34. Here again allowance must be made for the effect of later events. Perhaps Jesus simply said to Peter, 'Before dawn to-morrow you will deny that you know Me.' (The third watch of the night was called the 'cock-crowing,' i.e. 12–3 A.M., cp. Mark xiii. 35.) That Jesus should have said something of the kind to Peter is quite natural, for He knew the danger that His own arrest would bring upon His friends, and He foresaw that Peter's somewhat fickle nature would not stand the strain. Yet in Peter lay the hope for the future—*if* he came through.

Is it quite unnecessary, even to-day, to protest against the view of Peter's denial, as of Judas' treachery, that it was all arranged beforehand, part of God's plan; that the cock was, as it were, ordered by God to crow at the right moment, and that Peter could not help doing what he did?

this day, i.e. according to the Jewish reckoning, the new day having begun at sunset.

35–38. SWORDS

Peculiar to Luke

Of these rather difficult verses there seem to be two main lines of interpretation. To the one, the references to the buying of swords are to be taken literally, to the other, metaphorically, of facing a difficult

35 And he said unto them, When I sent you forth without
purse, and wallet, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they
36 said, Nothing. And he said unto them, But now, he that
hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet: and he
37 that hath none, let him sell his cloke, and buy a sword. For
I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in
me, And he was reckoned with transgressors: for that which
38 concerneth me hath fulfilment. And they said, Lord, behold,
here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough.

future. The sense will be: (1) 'You needed no purse or scrip or sandals when I sent you out before: but now you will need a purse and scrip, yes, and a sword at any cost. My death is near, and will bring danger for you.' 'Here are two swords.' 'Well, that will do.' 'Christ felt His death was determined and necessary. But that His work should not cease with His death was necessary also; the lives of the apostles must be preserved at any cost, so that in their case violence must be met with violence. This explains why the disciples were carrying swords in Gethsemane, an undoubted fact (Mark xiv. 47) that has been taken too much for granted; indeed as a matter of history the armed resistance of the band when Christ was seized may be a reason why Christianity was saved from extinction' (Easton, p. 329).

(2) 'You had an easy task enough when I sent you out before. But now the future will be difficult for you. My hours are numbered, and you will have to fight—' 'Fight, Lord? Here are two swords!' 'Two swords! Well, never mind.' Jesus' words are metaphorical and spoken with a sad irony. The disciples fail to understand and take Him literally; and Jesus, disappointed at their obtuseness, lets the subject drop. Taking this view Lagrange says: 'L'aspect légèrement paradoxal des paroles de Jésus, le peu d'intelligence des Apôtres, l'indulgence souriante du Maître sont des preuves d'authenticité reconnues par tout le monde' (*Luc*, p. 556). This view is attractive in itself and more easily reconciled both with Jesus' teaching on non-resistance as a whole, and with His words in *v.* 51 below (cp. Matt. xxvi. 52). 'It is unlikely that Jesus seriously entertained the thought of armed resistance, which indeed would be in conflict with the whole tenor of His life and teaching' (Creed, p. 270). Loisy suggests that Luke 'awkwardly constructed' the passage on the basis of the fact that the disciples did afterwards resist (*v.* 50 below).

35. Cp. x. 4, the instructions to the Seventy.

37. The quotation is from Isa. liii. 12, part of the 'Suffering Servant' songs, a passage which may well have played a considerable part in moulding Jesus' thought about His own Mission. *for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment.* Either 'Yes, that which concerns Me (i.e. the prophecies) is fulfilled,' or 'Yes, for My course is run.' The second is more pointed.

38. *It is enough.* 'Perhaps an ironical assent,...or perhaps a Semitic formula to break off the conversation' (Creed).

And he came out, and went, as his custom was, unto the 39
mount of Olives; and the disciples also followed him. And 40
when he was at the place, he said unto them, Pray that ye
enter not into temptation. And he was parted from them 41
about a stone's cast; and he kneeled down and prayed,

39–46. JESUS' PRAYER

Mark xiv. 32–42; Matt. xxvi. 36–46

Luke's account is shorter and simpler than the others, especially if it is held that *vv.* 43 and 44 are not part of the original text (see below).

A Jewish commentator's tribute to this story is worth quoting (on Mark): 'The details of this exquisite story must not be pressed, but it may well have a historic basis. For the tendency was to turn Jesus from a man into a God, and a God has no moments of fear and agony even if he is about to die.... One cannot but marvel at the wonderful grace and beauty, the exquisite tact and discretion, which the narrative displays. There is not a word too little; there is not a word too much' (Montefiore, I, p. 342).

This story, like the Temptation and the Transfiguration, may be taken as a record, preserved by His intimate friends, of Jesus' own inner experience. Death is very near Him, and the fear of death that is common to all men is in His heart. He prays, as earnestly as any man ever prayed, for release; but He adds—and it is the keynote of Christian prayer—'Thy will, not Mine, be done.' His prayer was answered not by release from the danger but by the power to face it bravely. Whether original or not Luke's words 'An angel appeared, strengthening Him' are a true interpretation. Mr G. A. Studdert Kennedy wrote as a chaplain during the war, 'The first prayer I want my little son to learn to say for me is not "God keep daddy safe," but "God make daddy brave, and if he has hard things to do, make him strong to do them."' That is the spirit of Jesus' prayer; and He goes out to face death in the strength that His prayer has brought Him.

41. *about a stone's cast.* Some commentators object either that the disciples were too far off to hear the words of Jesus' prayer: or that they could not have heard them because they were asleep. For the former objection there seems no evidence in the text: for the latter very little, for it is not stated that the disciples fell asleep at once or slept all the time. It would be natural to suppose that Jesus' prayer was a struggle which must have lasted a considerable time; that the disciples themselves did their best to obey His command and pray themselves (and so heard Him praying); but at last were overcome by sleep. Yet even if the words of Jesus' prayer are a subsequent 'attempt to express what the situation demanded—what the fear and despair of Jesus, contrasted with His subsequent calm, suggest that He must have said in His prayer,' they are a 'consummately successful' one (Montefiore). 'The records convey a living picture of what must have been His attitude of mind' (McNeile).

42 saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me:
43 nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. And there
appeared unto him an angel from heaven, strengthening
44 him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and
his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down
45 upon the ground. And when he rose up from his prayer, he
came unto the disciples, and found them sleeping for sorrow,
46 and said unto them, Why sleep ye? rise and pray, that ye
enter not into temptation.

42. Again a Jewish scholar's words are of interest to Christian readers. 'The simple and sublime words shew prayer at its highest.... The lesson of Gethsemane speaks to all. If we learn from the lives of heroes, we too have something here to learn. How much strength has the recollection of the prayer of Gethsemane given to endless human souls! And why should it not, even though for us Jesus is neither God nor Messiah, give strength to Jewish hearts also?' (Montefiore, I, p. 344). There are many, not Jews, yet standing outside the bounds of Christian orthodoxy, whose deepest feelings these words would perfectly express.

43–44. These two verses are omitted in some of the earliest MSS, but included in others. Of the Fathers, those who include them are as early as those who omit them. Either therefore the verses are a very early addition, or else they are original and have been omitted at an early date for some definite reason. As good reason may be given for the passage having been early supplied as for its having been early omitted. Thus 'such heightenings of painful scenes and the addition of miraculous elements are characteristic of hagiography everywhere. ...Luke's own tone is quite different' (Easton, p. 320). 'We gather from Epiphanius (*c.* A.D. 400), who defends the reading on account of its antiquity, that it caused serious perplexity to some orthodox persons as seemingly derogatory to the full Divinity of our Lord. Presumably it seemed beneath the dignity of the Uncreated Word Incarnate to evince such a degree of suffering; and still more to require a created angel as a comforter. Hence there was every reason, if not for excising it from the text, at least for regarding MSS in which it had been accidentally omitted as original' (Streeter, pp. 137–8). The Fourth Gospel entirely omits the incident, perhaps for the same reason. The question is probably best left undecided. If the verses are not part of the original text of Luke, they are a fragment of very early Christian tradition which interprets rightly, if in symbolical imagery, both the intensity of Jesus' prayer and the response to it.

44. This verse would come more naturally before *v.* 43. Cp. Heb. v. 7, 'Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death'—a reference to these verses.

45. *for sorrow.* Mark has 'for their eyes were very heavy.' Luke's version excuses the Apostles.

While he yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was 47
called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them; and he
drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, 48
Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss? And when 49
they that were about him saw what would follow, they said,
Lord, shall we smite with the sword? And a certain one of 50
them smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his
right ear. But Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. 51
And he touched his ear, and healed him. And Jesus said 52
unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders,

47–53. JESUS IS ARRESTED

Cp. Mark xiv. 43–52; Matt. xxvi. 47–56

47. Very close to Mark xiv. 43, but saying nothing of the 'traitor's kiss' being actually given—only attempted (and perhaps frustrated by Jesus). (Cp. John xviii.) For the '*multitude*,' see below (*v.* 52 note).

50. *a certain one of them*: Mark even vaguer, 'and one of the bystanders.' John says it was Peter, and the servant's name Malchus (John xviii. 10). 'Such additions may indicate either true knowledge, or the later love of supplying the names of places and persons' (Brooke in *Peake's Commentary*, p. 762). Luke agrees with John in saying that it was the man's *right* ear. Cadbury says 'Attention has often been called to the addition by Luke of the word "right" to the hand that was withered' (vi. 6) 'and the ear that was struck off. It has been thought to indicate that the third evangelist was a doctor. It is rather due to the free interpretation to which editors are accustomed' (*Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 178).

51. *Suffer ye thus far.* These words seem to be Jesus' response to the question and violent action of His disciples. They should probably therefore be understood 'Let them alone even up to this point,' i.e. 'Let them do their will' (in arresting Me)—spoken to the disciples, of the assailants. Jesus forbids further violence.

With regard to the miracle recorded (by Luke alone) in the second half of the verse, perhaps even the more conservative reader will admit that it was wholly probable, under the circumstances, that even if it had not taken place, a miracle was bound to appear sooner or later in the tradition. Harnack, who holds strongly that Luke was a doctor, says 'It would have been inexcusable' (in Luke's view) 'if Jesus, the miracle-working Physician, had not healed it' (*Luke the Physician*, p. 130). But a first-century Christian need not have been a doctor to feel how likely, if not certain, it was that Jesus should have blotted out the effect of His follower's act of violence—'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

52. Who were the 'multitude' in *v.* 47? Mark says they came 'from the high-priests and scribes and elders' (xiv. 43): commentators suggest that they were either a detachment of the Temple police, or

which were come against him, Are ye come out, as against
53 a robber, with swords and staves? When I was daily with
you in the temple, ye stretched not forth your hands against
me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.
54 And they seized him, and led him *away*, and brought him
into the high priest's house. But Peter followed afar off.
55 And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the court,
and had sat down together, Peter sat in the midst of them.

a band hired and armed for the occasion. Mark gives no indication that the authorities themselves were present. It is not impossible that one or two of them were—though certainly not the formal combination which Luke gives (*chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders*); but it is more probable that Luke has felt that Jesus' words (which he takes mainly from Mark) were more appropriately directed towards the authorities than towards their emissaries, and adapted the context accordingly.

53. *but this is your hour etc.* As Montefiore says, Luke's phrase 'sounds almost Johannine.' (Cp. John iii. 20, 'For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.') It suggests the inevitability and predestination of the events; 'I was at your mercy in the Temple but you could not touch Me, for the time was not yet come: now it is dark, and God has granted you permission to carry out what Satan has laid upon you.' The last words have a double meaning—of the works of darkness, and the darkness of the night. Cp. John xiii. 30 (of Judas), 'He...went out...: and it was night.' Blackness in the traitor's heart as he vanishes into the blackness of night.

54–62. PETER'S DENIAL

Cp. Mark xiv. 53, 54 and 66–72; Matt. xxvi. 57, 58 and 69–75

But Luke is using an independent source as well as Mark. He tells the story without a break; Mark inserts the trial of Jesus in it.

54. According to Mark and Matthew Jesus was tried at once, during the night—the Sanhedrin having immediately assembled. Luke, and John (who describes a preliminary examination also before Annas), say that the Sanhedrin met next morning to try Jesus. This is much more probable. See further on *vv.* 66 f. below.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel says that 'another disciple' (? John) who was a friend of the high priest persuaded the portress to let Peter in with him (John xviii. 15 f.).

55. 'At first, at any rate, Jesus is not, as in Mark, at once taken upstairs, but is left in the courtyard, bound and under guard. By adopting this variant tradition... Luke is able to make Jesus present at Peter's denial, and we get the wonderfully dramatic incident of *v.* 61' (Montefiore, II, p. 611). The house had a central courtyard out of which rooms opened, some of them approached by steps up.

And a certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light *of the* 56
fire, and looking stedfastly upon him, said, This man also
was with him. But he denied, saying, Woman, I know him 57
not. And after a little while another saw him, and said, Thou 58
also art *one* of them. But Peter said, Man, I am not. And 59
after the space of about one hour another confidently affirmed,
saying, Of a truth this man also was with him: for he is a
Galilæan. But Peter said, Man, I know not what thou sayest. 60
And immediately, while he yet spake, the cock crew. And 61
the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remem-
bered the word of the Lord, how that he said unto him,
Before the cock crow this day, thou shalt deny me thrice.
And he went out, and wept bitterly. 62

And the men that held *Jesus* mocked him, and beat him. 63
And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, Prophesy: 64
who is he that struck thee? And many other things spake 65
they against him, reviling him.

57. It was the fear of arrest which made Peter deny that he knew Jesus.

58. *Man*: xii. 14 note; not necessarily abrupt.

61. *And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter.* 'A sublime touch, but probably not historic' (Montefiore). 'Christ is supposed to have stood close enough to hear Peter's words' (Easton); if so, it is tempting to believe that the look which touched Peter so deeply at that moment was fixed in his memory and passed on from him into the tradition.

62. The verse is omitted by some MSS: and as it is exactly similar to Matt. xxvi. 75 (part), while Mark has quite different words, it should probably be regarded as an assimilation to Matthew, and rejected here.

63–65. JESUS ILL-TREATED

Cp. Mark xiv. 65; Matt. xxvi. 67, 68

But again Luke is independent, for in Mark Jesus is ill-treated by the Sanhedrin themselves after the trial; here before the trial and by the guards, a much more credible version.

64. They blindfold Jesus, and then hit Him and say 'tell us who hit you.' 'The verse indicates that the officers knew that Christ was thought to claim supernatural knowledge' (Easton).

In this verse, as in other parts of the account of the Passion, the possible influence of the O.T. must not be lost sight of. Commentators quote such passages as Isa. l. 6, liii. 3–5; 1 Kings xxii. 24, and suggest that they may have helped to mould this passage, more especially in Mark's version of it.

66 And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council, saying,

66–71. JESUS BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN

Cp. Mark xiv. 55–64; Matt. xxvi. 59–66

It must be remembered that as there was obviously no follower of Jesus present, what is actually said to have occurred when He was before the Sanhedrin can hardly depend on first-hand authority. There is, in point of fact, considerable obscurity—as to both the nature and the legality of the proceedings—which centres round two points: (1) Had the Sanhedrin at this time the power to try cases where the penalty was death; and were the proceedings therefore really a 'trial,' or were they merely a preliminary investigation? (2) What was the charge on which Jesus was really condemned? A full discussion will be found in Montefiore on Mark (I, p. 351 f.). A special study on the subject is *The Prosecution of Jesus: its Date, History and Legality* (1916), by R. W. Husband. Dr Moffatt's article 'Trial of Jesus' in *HDCG* is clear and helpful. There seems to be an increasing agreement that the proceedings before the Sanhedrin were what Rawlinson describes as 'Grand Jury proceedings, directed towards the discovery and formulation of a charge which would lie in a Roman criminal court'; and that the charge on which Jesus is finally denounced to Pilate is an avowal of Messiahship. Mark is in that case inaccurate in representing the Sanhedrin as condemning Jesus.

Luke's narrative is shorter than Mark's. He says nothing of the charge of predicting the destruction of the Temple, which in Mark seems to obscure the issue. Such a charge might well have had great weight—if established, as in this case it apparently was not—with the Sanhedrin, but none at all with Pilate. Yet it seems likely that it was made, and had some foundation in fact.

66. *as soon as it was day.* Cp. *v.* 54 note. 'If a reconstruction of the events of Christ's last night is to be attempted, the following scheme seems to offer the fewest difficulties:—After the arrest Christ was taken before Annas for a short informal examination, and was then brought before the Sanhedrin at daybreak. Luke thought the first examination unimportant; it is related only by John (doubtless with didactic modifications). Mark knew that there were two hearings and he knew what went on before the Sanhedrin, but he attached the latter account to the wrong hearing. Matthew simply followed Mark' (Easton, p. 339).

the assembly of the elders. Cp. Acts xxii. 5. A general term for the Sanhedrin, the words that follow being in apposition to it. *their council.* It would seem simplest to take this word as meaning here the 'place of assembly,' 'court-house': Lagrange and others, however, argue that the word should be given its more common sense of the 'assembly' itself, i.e. the Sanhedrin as formally constituted a court of justice. 'La nuance qui sépare les deux mots' (i.e. 'assembly' and 'council')

If thou art the Christ, tell us. But he said unto them, If I 67
tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask *you*, ye will not 68
answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated 69
at the right hand of the power of God. And they all said, 70
Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye
say that I am. And they said, What further need have we 71
of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.

And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him 23

'est celle qu'il y a entre une assemblée politique et un tribunal, l'assemblée pouvant se constituer en haute cour de justice' (Lagrange, p. 571).

67–70. Challenged by the direct question with regard to Messiahship, Jesus (in Luke) gives an indefinite answer (in Mark He says 'I am'). 'There is no use in argument; your minds are made up. But soon the Son of Man will be manifested in power.' Luke then records a further question, which he no doubt understood as distinct from, and going further than, the first: 'Are you the Son of God?' To this Jesus replies in what can only, in view of the sequel, be interpreted as an affirmative. Luke's version seems less original than Mark's.

69. *from henceforth*, i.e. 'as a result of what is happening now.' 'In spite of your rejection of Me' (or through it) 'God will acknowledge His Messiah and set up His kingdom.' Ps. cx. 1; Dan. vii. 13.

70. There seems to be little evidence that 'Son of God' was a Messianic title among the Jews (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 272). Luke's version of the passage seems therefore to be more 'developed' than Mark's. 'To Luke and his readers Son of God is the supreme title of Jesus, which was capable of expressing His universal significance, whereas the use of "Christ" as a title naturally tended to become subordinate' (Creed).

Ye say that I am. Cp. Matthew. 'Thou hast said.' This phrase can be understood either as a mere affirmative; or as a qualified assent, implying some reservation on the speaker's part. Its exact force here is not clear.

71. No formal verdict is given, as in Mark, 'they all judged Him worthy of death.' Cp. note at beginning of section.

XXIII. 1–5. JESUS BEFORE PILATE

Cp. Mark xv. 1–5; Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11–14

Luke is largely independent, except for *v.* 3 (see note).

1. Some words of Montefiore, if exaggerated, yet give a salutary warning: 'We now pass from a difficult and hardly conceivable trial before the Jewish authorities to a difficult and hardly conceivable trial before Pilate. The historic residue in both cases seems to reduce itself to the bare fact. Some Jewish authorities procured the arrest of Jesus. They found some means of holding or declaring Him worthy of death —some charges upon which they could secure His condemnation from

2 before Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king.
3 And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews?
4 And he answered him and said, Thou sayest. And Pilate said unto the chief priests and the multitudes, I find no fault
5 in this man. But they were the more urgent, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judæa, and

Pilate. He was brought before Pilate, and Pilate condemned Him to death' (I, p. 370). Fortunately the details do not matter.

Pilate was appointed procurator of the Roman province of Judaea, which consisted of Samaria and the country south of it to Gaza and the Dead Sea, by Tiberius in A.D. 26: and held office for ten years. The accounts of him given in Jewish writers such as Josephus are damning, but are no doubt prejudiced. At the times of Jewish festivals the procurator used to come to Jerusalem from Caesarea, his usual headquarters, so as to be on the spot in case of need. Thus he was in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover.

The famous words of Tacitus may be quoted at this point: '*Auctor nominis eius*' (i.e. Christian) '*Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est*' (*Annals*, XV, 44). The whole passage, which describes the Neronian persecution, should be read.

2. Luke alone gives the charges on which the Jews committed Jesus to Pilate. The first is that of being a political agitator, and would refer to the general stir caused by Jesus' Ministry. Easton suggests that it may have 'been based on disorders that were actually caused here and there by Christ's teaching; cf. Acts xxiv. 5.' The second refers to the 'tribute-money,' and has no foundation in Jesus' recorded words on the subject (xx. 25).

Christ a king. Either 'Messiah, a king,' the word 'king' being an explanation or interpretation for Pilate's benefit: or 'King Messiah,' a 'thoroughly Jewish expression' (McNeile).

3. This verse is taken over from Mark, and obviously breaks the logical sequence of Luke's account. For it seems impossible that Pilate, after obtaining in *v.* 3 an admission of the most serious charge, should immediately in *v.* 4 declare Jesus innocent. In Luke's source *v.* 4 presumably followed *v.* 2, thus giving merely a summary of the charges and a statement of Pilate's verdict. The more conservative commentators (e.g. Lagrange, Plummer) explain the inconsequence of the passage as it stands by supposing that it implies John xviii. 35–38 —the conversation between Pilate and Jesus about Truth.

Thou sayest: xxii. 70 note.

4. *the multitudes* appear here earlier than in Mark, and with less probability. Luke is fond of introducing them.

Even more clearly than Mark, Luke's account exonerates Pilate at the expense of the Jews.

5. *Judæa*, i.e. Palestine, iv. 44 note.

beginning from Galilee even unto this place. But when Pilate 6
heard it, he asked whether the man were a Galilæan. And 7
when he knew that he was of Herod's jurisdiction, he sent
him unto Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem in these
days.

Now when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for 8
he was of a long time desirous to see him, because he had
heard concerning him; and he hoped to see some miracle
done by him. And he questioned him in many words; but 9

6–12. JESUS BEFORE HEROD

Peculiar to Luke

There does not seem to be any very good reason for denying the historicity of this section, which is natural enough in itself, unless one takes, with Loisy, the view that the third evangelist is nothing but an inventor of fiction and is therefore, when unsupported, always lying. It has been attacked on the ground that there was not time for the event if, as Mark says, Jesus was crucified 'at the third hour,' i.e. 9 A.M. But it is now widely held that Mark's time is not to be relied on, and that John is nearer the truth when he gives the time as noon.

'If Herod was paying a visit to the capital, he was certainly the competent authority for dealing with one of his subjects, and the acknowledgement of his jurisdiction by the Roman Governor was at once a compliment which the tetrarch was likely to appreciate, and offered Pilate a way out of a situation he did not like' (Warschauer, p. 326). 'If the incident had been invented, Christ's acquittal would have been made much less unambiguous and undignified. On the other hand, Antipas is made to act in entire conformity to his known character' (i.e. of curiosity and cynicism), 'something in which later tradition would have no interest' (Easton).

If, however, the story is not historical, it may have come from a cycle of tradition similar to that found in the apocryphal 'gospel of Peter,' in which Jesus is tried and condemned by Herod. For Luke's knowledge of the Herodian family and court, cp. viii. 3 (Chuza, Herod's 'steward'), Acts xiii. 1 (Manaen, Herod's 'foster-brother'), Acts xii. 20 (Blastus, Herod Agrippa's chamberlain).

7. Pilate sends Jesus to Herod in order to get further advice on His case. It does not seem likely that Pilate hoped or tried to transfer the final responsibility to Herod; for the Roman authority would have to take the final decision on a case concerning alleged offences against the Roman law.

9. Jesus is silent before Herod, as Mark and Matthew had represented Him before Pilate (Mark xv. 5; Matt. xxvii. 14). Isa. liii. 7, 'He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth,' may have contributed

10 he answered him nothing. And the chief priests and the
11 scribes stood, vehemently accusing him. And Herod with
his soldiers set him at nought, and mocked him, and arraying
12 him in gorgeous apparel sent him back to Pilate. And Herod
and Pilate became friends with each other that very day:
for before they were at enmity between themselves.
13 And Pilate called together the chief priests and the rulers
14 and the people, and said unto them, Ye brought unto me
this man, as one that perverteth the people: and behold, I,
having examined him before you, found no fault in this man
15 touching those things whereof ye accuse him: no, nor yet

to this representation—or, if it is historical, Jesus may have had the passage in His mind. But His silence is natural enough here, in the face of idle curiosity such as Herod's.

11. Herod is disappointed, and after a mocking (which may perhaps have been transferred to this story from Mark xv. 16–19, where it is related of Pilate's soldiers) sends Jesus back to Pilate. If Herod really 'mocked' Jesus, he must have given Him the *gorgeous apparel* to ridicule His alleged kingship. 'The prosecutors are credited to the point of believing that Christ had made royal claims of some sort, but Herod treats these as too ridiculous to be worthy of a magistrate's attention. He expressed his opinion by arraying the prisoner in robes of mock royalty' (Easton, p. 342). But A. W. Verrall in a well-known essay, 'Christ before Herod' (originally published in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April 1909, reprinted in a volume of essays, *The Bacchants of Euripides*), takes a quite different view. He believes that the mocking was really directed not against Jesus but against His accusers. Herod is 'well pleased to disoblige and snub the Sanhedrin,' and when sending Jesus back to Pilate gives Him a 'rich and valuable costume' as 'a royal gift and mark of favour.'

13–25. PILATE, BARABBAS AND JESUS

13–16 are peculiar to Luke. For 17–25 cp. Mark xv. 6–15; Matt. xxvii. 15–26

13. *and the people.* Cp. *v.* 4 above. The 'people' does not appear till later in Mark and Matthew; who are no doubt right, for it is out of place as yet.

14–16. Pilate proposes a compromise—scourging. Neither his own investigations, nor those of Herod, have revealed anything seriously culpable in the Prisoner, though He has made rash claims. In judging the evangelists' representation of these events, one must not forget their natural desire to attach more guilt to the Jews by exculpating other authorities. Luke, like John, three times records Pilate's statement, 'I find no fault in Him' (Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22; John xviii. 38, xix. 4, 6).

Herod: for he sent him back unto us; and behold, nothing worthy of death hath been done by him. I will therefore 16
chastise him, and release him. But they cried out all together, 18
saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas:
one who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for 19
murder, was cast into prison. And Pilate spake unto them 20
again, desiring to release Jesus; but they shouted, saying, 21
Crucify, crucify him. And he said unto them the third time, 22
Why, what evil hath this man done? I have found no cause
of death in him: I will therefore chastise him and release
him. But they were instant with loud voices, asking that 23

15. *for he sent him back unto us.* Some MSS read (as in A.V.) 'for I sent you to him.' The reading in the text does not give good sense unless it is held either that Pilate had hoped to have seen the last of Jesus when he sent Him to Herod, which is unlikely (*v.* 7 note above); or that 'Herod's contemptuous dismissal of Jesus is interpreted as equivalent to an acquittal on the charge of sedition' (Creed). The Syriac versions give 'For I sent Him to him': some think this the original reading, which gave rise to the variants noted above.

18. *Away with this man.* Streeter points out (p. 405) contacts with John both in this verse and in *v.* 21. These words may be compared with John xix. 15, 'Away with him, away with him'; and in *v.* 21 the double 'crucify' with John xix. 6.

The sudden and somewhat awkward introduction of Barabbas here is best explained by the view that Luke has introduced the references to him from Mark into his own source, which did not originally mention him. In Mark he is introduced more naturally.

Nothing is known of Barabbas outside the Gospels: nor is there any other evidence for the custom, spoken of by Mark and Matthew, of releasing a prisoner at the festival. That such a custom should have existed is somewhat unlikely; and those who defend the historicity of the Barabbas incident mostly admit that the custom was probably peculiar to Pilate, and only temporary—or that the release of Barabbas was an isolated act of clemency. Others regard the whole passage as a further product of the desire to throw deeper guilt upon the Jews; and the priests in particular. But 'the statements about Barabbas seem very precise, and suggest that some historical reminiscence is at the bottom of the tale' (Montefiore, I, p. 373).

19. *in the city*: added by Luke. Cadbury (*Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 245 f.) suggests that Luke writes generally 'from the urban standpoint' and gives many examples, both in the Gospel and Acts, of Luke's interest in cities. 'Luke seems to think it worth while to note the city as the scene or scope of what he has to tell, even when he has made no mention of the city by name.'

23. There is much that is hard to understand in the behaviour both of Pilate and of the people. Pilate does not behave like a Roman

24 he might be crucified. And their voices prevailed. And Pilate
25 gave sentence that what they asked for should be done. And
he released him that for insurrection and murder had been
cast into prison, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered
up to their will.
26 And when they led him away, they laid hold upon one
Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country, and laid on him
the cross, to bear it after Jesus.

governor, nor in accordance with his personal reputation for ruthless cruelty. This is particularly seen in his words in Mark, 'What then do you wish that I shall do with Him whom you call the king of the Jews?' on which Montefiore comments: 'The rejoinder of Pilate is almost ludicrously inappropriate for a Roman governor. But the motive is obvious. The Jews are to pronounce the sentence, not Pilate' (I, p. 375). Cp. Creed, 'Pilate gave sentence that *what they asked* should be done, and surrendered Jesus *to their will*. Luke's narrative almost seems to suggest that it was the Jews who took Jesus away to be crucified' (p. 283). Montefiore goes on: 'That the people are now against Jesus is...not psychologically quite incredible. Jesus had disappointed them. He had played and lost. The hope which he had aroused in them had been dashed to the ground by his arrest. Let him pay the penalty for his folly. It is also possible that the priestly party had helped to this change of feeling.' If Barabbas had been responsible for, or concerned in some popular movement against the Romans, the people's enthusiasm for him would be natural enough. Matthew calls him a 'notable' prisoner. Many readers, however, will feel that there is some truth in Warschauer's remarks: 'In the latter detail' (the people's cry of 'crucify') 'we see merely the Evangelists' determination to make all the Jews appear in the most odious light possible, obsessed with a blind and baseless malice against the Saviour. That Pilate should have had no choice but to give in to this insensate clamour, with a garrison at his disposal for the suppression of disorder, is another quite unlikely trait in a narrative which it is impossible to accept as history' (p. 328).

25. 'The final scene in the tragedy is related in language of liturgical solemnity' (Easton).

26–32. THE WAY TO CALVARY

For *v.* 26 cp. Mark xv. 21; Matt. xxvii. 32. The rest is peculiar to Luke.

26. *Simon.* He is described by Mark as 'the father of Alexander and Rufus,' who were no doubt known to Mark or to his circle. *Cyrene* is on the north coast of Africa, in the modern Tripoli. *from the country*: i.e. from outside the city walls. The phrase is sometimes interpreted as meaning 'from his work in the fields' or 'from his farm,' and then used as evidence that the day is not the Passover sabbath. But this

And there followed him a great multitude of the people, 27
and of women who bewailed and lamented him. But Jesus 28
turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not
for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. For 29
behold, the days are coming, in which they shall say, Blessed
are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the
breasts that never gave suck. Then shall they begin to say 30
to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. For 31
if they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done
in the dry?

And there were also two others, malefactors, led with him 32
to be put to death.

does not seem justified, for, as Rawlinson says (p. 232), Simon may have been 'a Jewish pilgrim who happened to be entering the city at this precise moment from his lodging outside.'

What is known of the details of the crucifixion of criminals will be found in *HDCG*, art. 'Crucifixion.' The procedure varied. It seems probable that the criminal normally carried his own 'cross' (probably merely the cross-bar, the upright post being fixed permanently in the ground), as is suggested by John xix. 17 ('He, bearing His cross, went forth...'); and that Jesus was relieved by Simon owing to weakness. Simon is 'impressed' for the duty by the soldiers.

27–31. Montefiore (following Loisy) says of this passage: 'It is probably unhistorical, being made up out of a number of O.T. reminiscences' (II, p. 623). Possibly prophecy has coloured the details of a scrap of true tradition.

27. Cp. Zech. xii. 10 f., 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him...and shall be in bitterness for him....In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem... and the land shall mourn....'

28 f. 'You will need all your sorrow for yourselves. Days are coming when the reproach of the childless will be turned to a blessing. Death itself will be a boon. For there is far worse to come.'

28. Cp. Jer. xxii. 10, 'Weep ye not for the dead, neither bemoan him: but weep sore for him that goeth away....'

29. In the dreadful time to come the childless will be fortunate. Cp. Isa. liv. 1, 'Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child.'

30. Hosea x. 8.

31. Cp. Ezek. xx. 47, 'I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in thee, and every dry tree....' The saying seems to be a proverb. Its application here is variously understood. 'If the innocent Jesus meets such a fate, what will be the fate of the guilty Jerusalem?' (Creed). Others interpret 'If such deeds are done while the nation is still prosperous, what will happen when its life is withered and its doom near?' The first seems best.

33 And when they came unto the place which is called The
skull, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on
34 the right hand and the other on the left. And Jesus said,
Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And
35 parting his garments among them, they cast lots. And the

33–38. THE CRUCIFIXION

Mark xv. 22–32; Matt. xxvii. 33–44

From this point to xxiv. 10 Luke corresponds somewhat more closely to Mark. Speaking of Luke's 'non-Marcan' source Streeter says: 'Its account of the actual Crucifixion, and probably also of the Entombment, seems to have been quite brief—possibly little more than a bare statement of the facts—so that . . . Luke reverses his ordinary procedure and makes Mark his main source' (p. 217).

33. *The skull* (Mark, Matthew 'Golgotha'); i.e. a hill, from its shape. Luke, as usual, translates the Hebrew.

34. The first half of this verse (*And Jesus said . . . they do*) is omitted by some of the best MSS, and the words have usually been regarded as not part of the original text of Luke. Harnack, however, and more recently Streeter (p. 138), have supported their originality on the ground that they were likely to have been omitted either 'because some Christian in the second century found it hard to believe that God could or ought to forgive the Jews'; or because 'it would have appeared to a second-century Christian that, as a mere matter of fact, God had not forgiven the Jews. Twice within seventy years Jerusalem had been destroyed and hundreds of thousands of Jews massacred and enslaved. It followed that if Christ had prayed that prayer, God had declined to grant it.' It is hard, however, not to agree with Creed: 'The omission of a prayer so sublime and so Christ-like seems less probable than its insertion.'

But, whether the words are part of Luke or not, they are entirely characteristic of the spirit of Christianity, and of Jesus Himself. Even if not historical, they are a supreme tribute to His memory. What nobler witness could be borne to the impression that Jesus made upon His followers, than that such words should be attributed to Him at such a moment? (cp. Acts vii. 60 (Stephen's martyrdom): 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge').

An interesting discussion of the 'Words from the Cross,' both from the critical and devotional standpoints, will be found in W. M. Pryke's *Modernism as a Working Faith*, chapter VI (Heffer, 1925). Mr Pryke discusses frankly yet reassuringly the bearing on traditional Christian devotion of the doubts which criticism has raised concerning the historicity of the 'Seven Words.'

parting his garments. Criminals were crucified quite naked, and their clothes were the perquisites of those who carried out the sentence.

they cast lots. This seems to be a reminiscence of Ps. xxii. 18, 'They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots' (quoted in John xix. 24).

people stood beholding. And the rulers also scoffed at him, saying, He saved others; let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God, his chosen. And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar, and saying, If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself. And there was also a superscription over him, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, Art not thou the Christ? save thyself and us. But the other answered, and rebuking him said, Dost thou not even fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said,

35. *He saved others*.... 'This man, who wrought such boasted gifts of healing in the past, has lost his power: hence he is not Messiah' (Easton). Montefiore says that *the rulers* 'would hardly have come out on purpose to feast their eyes upon the spectacle of their enemy upon the cross. That kind of thing rather befits the officers of the Inquisition than the members of the Sanhedrin' (I, p. 382). He seems probably right.

36–37. This mockery by the soldiers is unlikely. Such conduct would scarcely have been tolerated while on duty. If the *vinegar* of which Luke speaks was offered by soldiers to Jesus (cp. Mark xv. 36; Matt. xxvii. 48), it was offered as an act of kindness; and was not actual vinegar, as Luke here seems to suppose (cp. Ps. lxix. 21, 'In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink'), but the soldiers' *posca*, or sour wine.

38. According to John, this was written in Aramaic, Latin and Greek (John xix. 20).

39–43. THE TWO ROBBERS

Verse 39 is partly similar to Mark xv. 32 and Matt. xxvii. 44. The rest is peculiar to Luke.

Easton's comment is concise and to the point. 'It is difficult to argue for much historic basis in this section' (p. 350). Mark says (xv. 32) that they both reviled Jesus; but, apart from this, the robber's acknowledgement of Jesus as Messiah, and Jesus' promise of bliss, seems to move rather in the realm of legend than of history. Loisy sees in the two robbers types of unbelieving Judaism on the one hand, and the converted Gentiles on the other. It is less fanciful to suppose as the origin of the story such a motive as the desire to pay tribute to the Majesty and Mercy of the dying Saviour; or to emphasise the rewards of conversion.

42. The well-known rendering of A.V., 'Lord, remember me...,' is due to the insertion of 'Lord' in later MSS, probably because the manner of address was felt to be too abrupt. Jesus is nowhere else in the Gospels addressed simply as 'Jesus.' No doubt the same motive was at work elsewhere in the tradition at a much earlier stage.

43 Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom. And
he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou
be with me in Paradise.
44 And it was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came
45 over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun's light
failing: and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst.

in thy kingdom: this is probably the right reading, i.e. at the Parousia, the return of the Messiah in glory. 'When thou comest *into* Thy kingdom' is an interpretation of the Christian theologian, of Christ returning to His Father's throne.

43. *in Paradise.* This word has an interesting history. It was of Persian origin and is used in Xenophon for a park or garden; then of the garden of Eden; then of the 'cool and fragrant resting-place awaiting the faithful after death,' i.e. the intermediate state preceding the resurrection. The word is used three times in N.T. Dr Charles defines it thus: '(i) The abode of the blessed *in Hades* (Luke xxiii. 43; cp. Acts ii. 31); (ii) A division of *the third heaven*, being likewise an intermediate abode of the righteous (2 Cor. xii. 4); (iii) Apparently a final abode of the righteous (Rev. ii. 7)' (*Eschatology*, pp. 473–4). 'In the later Judaism the conception of an immediate transition at death to an appropriate state of bliss or punishment lay alongside the idea of the final judgment' (Creed).

44–49. JESUS' DEATH

Mark xv. 33–41; Matt. xxvii. 45–56

44. John (xix. 14) mentions 'the sixth hour' as the time when Jesus' trial before Pilate was ending. According to Mark, Jesus was crucified at the 'third hour': and thus spent six hours on the cross. Cp. note on *vv.* 6–12 above (first paragraph).

To speculate on the nature of the *darkness* or to seek evidence of a possible eclipse at the time is futile. Like the rending of the Temple veil, and the earthquake and resurrection of the saints described by Matthew (xxvii. 51–52), these portents are legendary additions to the story made with the idea that miraculous occurrences must have attended such an event as the death of the Son of God. No doubt O.T. passages aided their production (cp., for the darkness, Amos viii. 9, 'In that day, saith the Lord God, I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day'—a remarkably close parallel to Luke's words).

45. *and the veil etc.* Between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies there was a curtain called 'the second veil,' to distinguish it from the curtain which separated the outer court from the Holy Place. The symbolism behind this tradition is seen in Heb. ix and x. Before Jesus' death there was a barrier between God and men: through Jesus the Christian has free access to the Father.

And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, 46
into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he
gave up the ghost. And when the centurion saw what was 47
done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous

46. The words here attributed to Jesus as His last cry come from Ps. xxxi. 5. Mark and Matthew give 'My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken Me?' (Ps. xxii. 1); John (xix. 30), 'It is finished.' Some words of Warschauer (p. 337) well sum up the situation: 'All we know for certain is that Jesus, having endured to the uttermost...of unspeakable agony, uttered a loud cry, and gave up the ghost; neither dare we intrude upon that tragic fact with any conjecture of our own as to the thoughts which may have passed through His mind in those closing moments of His earthly life. In suggesting His last words, our Evangelists strike three chords which, taken together, probably come as near to the truth as it is possible to do.'

It has often been argued that Luke refrains from recording the words given by Mark because he interpreted them as a cry of despair and thought them unsuitable. Their inclusion in Mark suggests, however, that the words were not necessarily so interpreted; but either simply as the first words of a Psalm which was regarded as specially Messianic, or in accordance with the hope and confidence of the later verses of the Psalm (Rawlinson, *ad loc.*). It is therefore perhaps best to regard Luke's alteration as due to the independent tradition of his other source.

Discussion of the Christian doctrine of Atonement is beyond the scope of a commentary. Yet it should be pointed out that so far as the Synoptic Gospels are concerned there is no evidence whatever that any 'theory' of Atonement was present to the mind of Jesus or of His disciples. Jesus no doubt believed that through His death the Kingdom would come. It was left to Christians after Him (cp. xxiv. 25–27 note) to find in His death a more specifically redemptive meaning. Those who wish for a clear view of the subject, unobscured by the mists of ecclesiastical tradition, should read Dr Rashdall's Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* (Macmillan, 1920).

47. *what was done*: Mark, more definitely, 'that He so gave up the ghost.' Matthew 'the earthquake and the things that were done,' referring to the portents which he describes. From Mark's and Luke's account it is not quite clear what we are intended to understand as having so deeply impressed the centurion—either the darkness, or the cry, or the general bearing of Jesus and the manner of His death. There may be truth in Warschauer's words (p. 337): 'The piety of believers felt that no one could have witnessed that passing without being stirred to confess the majesty of that great Sufferer; and it pleased the Church to represent the Gentiles, here personified in a rude soldier, as readier to acknowledge the Divinity of the Lord than His own countrymen, the Jews.'

Instead of *a righteous man* Mark has 'the (a) son of God.' It has

48 man. And all the multitudes that came together to this
sight, when they beheld the things that were done, returned
49 smiting their breasts. And all his acquaintance, and the
women that followed with him from Galilee, stood afar off,
seeing these things.

50 And behold, a man named Joseph, who was a councillor,
51 a good man and a righteous (he had not consented to their
counsel and deed), *a man* of Arimathæa, a city of the Jews,
52 who was looking for the kingdom of God: this man went to

been argued either that Luke has altered Mark from 'a wish to add one more testimony to Jesus' innocence,' or that he is here independent of Mark and preserves an earlier and less 'developed' tradition. It should be noticed that Mark's phrase does not necessarily mean '*the* Son of God' but 'a son of a god,' i.e. 'a demigod' or 'divine being'; nor, of course, to the centurion could it, if historical, have had any of the Christian implications which it doubtless carried to Mark himself.

48. The crowd too is impressed and terrified. The contrast with their former attitude seems too strong to be historical.

49. Some of Luke's words are reminiscences of Psalms (xxxviii. 11, lxxxviii. 8); otherwise cp. Mark (xv. 40), who gives the women's names. Luke's phrase *all his acquaintance, and the women* suggests that the Apostles as well as the women were present; whereas Mark speaks only of the women, for all the Apostles had 'left Him and fled' (Mark xiv. 50). Probably, however, this is merely the result of Luke's introduction of the word 'acquaintance' from the Psalm.

50–56. THE BURIAL

Cp. Mark xv. 42–47; Matt. xxvii. 57–61

Luke is mostly independent, but the lengthy and awkward sentence in *vv.* 50–53 is presumably due to his combination of Mark and his other source.

50. *a councillor*: i.e. a member of the Sanhedrin.

51. *Arimathæa*—Joseph's birthplace, presumably, not necessarily his home—is said by Eusebius and Jerome to be the same as a place called Ramathaim near Lydda; but there is much doubt on the point (Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 411).

who was looking for the kingdom of God. Comparison with ii. 25 and 38 (of Simeon) suggests that the phrase does not necessarily mean that Joseph was a disciple of Jesus, but simply that he was one of those Pharisees who were eagerly looking forward to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom, and sympathetic towards Jesus' teaching. Matthew however says outright that he was a disciple, and his action is perhaps easier to understand on this supposition. John (xix. 38) describes Joseph as 'a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews.'

An alternative view holds that Joseph's action is prompted merely

Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. And he took it down, 53
and wrapped it in a linen cloth, and laid him in a tomb that
was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain. And it 54
was the day of the Preparation, and the sabbath drew on.
And the women, which had come with him out of Galilee, 55
followed after, and beheld the tomb, and how his body was
laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments. 56
And on the sabbath they rested according to the command-

by a strict Jew's desire to fulfil the law of Deut. xxi. 22: 'If a man have committed a sin worthy of death. . . and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt surely bury him the same day' (Lake, *Hist. Evidence for Resurrection, etc.*, p. 171 f.). It is true that, as Lake says, such a motive 'would certainly have animated all the members of the Sanhedrin': but it is strange that one of them should have carried out the burial in person.

54. The day was Friday, at sunset on which the sabbath began: all must be finished before then.

55. Mark gives the women's names as 'Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother (?) of Joses.' Here, as in *v.* 49 above, Luke does not name them.

56. Peculiar to Luke. Mark says they *bought* spices, after the sabbath was over, while Luke suggests that they already possessed them. They have seen that Joseph's actions are hasty and incomplete, and determine to supplement them at the earliest possible opportunity, i.e. as soon as it was light on the Sunday morning. It would be too dark on Saturday evening after the sabbath was over.

spices and ointments: 'sweet herbs and perfumed oils,' for embalming.

XXIV. 1–12. THE WOMEN AT THE TOMB

Cp. Mark xvi. 1–8; Matt. xxviii. 1–10

Full discussion either of the varying traditions of the different Gospels with regard to the Resurrection, or of the historical value of what they record, would be outside the scope of this commentary. Lake's *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (1907) is still the clearest summary and discussion of the evidence, including the account given in the Gospel of Peter, a most interesting narrative. But something will be said on these subjects, as well as on their theological and religious bearing, at the end of this chapter.

In these eleven verses (*v.* 12 is probably interpolated; see note) Luke gives a different account from that in Mark, with perhaps some touches from Mark added. Luke's differences from Mark are: (1) that the women are said to have 'prepared,' not 'bought,' spices (xxiii. 56 note); (2) that they see 'two men,' not 'a young man'; (3) in the words addressed to them. Mark's promise to the disciples that they shall see Jesus in Galilee becomes in Luke a mere reference to words

24 ment. But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they
came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had
2 prepared. And they found the stone rolled away from the
3 tomb. And they entered in, and found not the body of the
4 Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, while they were perplexed
thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in dazzling
5 apparel: and as they were affrighted, and bowed down their
faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the
6 living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember
7 how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying
that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of
sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.
8,9 And they remembered his words, and returned from the
tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the
10 rest. Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and
Mary the *mother* of James: and the other women with them

of Jesus 'in Galilee'; and the remaining events of the chapter take place at or near Jerusalem (Mark implies, and Matthew describes, appearances of Jesus in Galilee). (4) Mark suggests that through fear the women did not deliver their message ('they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid of—,' at which point the text of Mark breaks off). Luke says that the women at once described their experiences to the 'eleven and all the rest.' (5) The third woman's name in Mark is Salome, in Luke Joanna.

1. The second half of xxiii. 56 should have been included in this chapter.

2. Mark says that the women wondered, as they went, who would remove the stone for them. Luke has not even mentioned the stone before.

4. The *two men* are angels, as their dazzling raiment shews; cp. ix. 29, where 'dazzling' is used of Jesus' raiment at the Transfiguration. Why *two* men, when Mark mentions only one? Lake suggests that the Jews believed that when carrying God's messages angels normally went in pairs, or even in larger groups (pp. 185, 281). John xx. 12, and Acts i. 10 (at the Ascension), speak of two angels. Tradition was very likely to vary on such a point: and there is very little in these verses (3–5) which suggests that Luke is using Mark.

6. *remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee.* Mark has 'But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.' Matthew is similar. Luke's reference to Galilee is so pointless that it cannot be held to be other than an alteration of Mark to suit the 'Jerusalem' tradition which Luke is following.

8. 'Luke seems to imply that the women were among the disciples addressed' ('in Galilee') (Easton).

told these things unto the apostles. And these words ap- 11
peared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them.
But Peter arose, and ran unto the tomb; and stooping and 12
looking in, he seeth the linen cloths by themselves; and he
departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to
pass.

And behold, two of them were going that very day to a 13
village named Emmaus, which was threescore furlongs from
Jerusalem. And they communed with each other of all these 14
things which had happened. And it came to pass, while they 15
communed and questioned together, that Jesus himself drew
near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden that 16
they should not know him. And he said unto them, What 17
communications are these that ye have one with another,
as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad. And one of 18
them, named Cleopas, answering said unto him, Dost thou

12. Omitted by some MSS. It is certainly not original, for it is merely a summary of John xx. 3–10, inserted with a harmonising motive.

13–35. THE WALK TO EMMAUS

Peculiar to Luke

This is, according to Luke, the first appearance of Jesus after His Resurrection. Like the other appearances which he describes it takes place in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and on the same day as the visit of the women to the tomb. It is a peculiarly beautiful story, whether regarded as history or legend.

13. *that very day*. All the events in this chapter, including the Ascension, are presented as having happened 'on the third day.'

threescore furlongs: nearly seven miles. Emmaus has not been certainly identified: a discussion will be found in Lake (p. 99 f.), or, more elaborately, at the end of Lagrange's commentary.

15. *drew near*. 'He overtook them, for they assume that He comes from Jerusalem (*v.* 18), from which they are walking' (Plummer). What they were 'questioning' about is shewn in *v.* 19 f. They could not understand the death of Jesus, or credit the story of the women.

16. Luke no doubt implies a miracle.

17. The word translated *looking sad* is a classical word (used also in Matt. vi. 16), meaning 'angry-' or 'sullen-looking.' They halted suddenly, partly perhaps in irritation, partly in distress at the stranger's words which break into their perplexity and unhappiness.

18. *Cleopas*. There is a 'Clopas' in John xix. 25. The name seems to be the same, but there is no evidence for identification. Origen spoke of the other disciple, who is not named by Luke, as 'Simon.' Eusebius says that 'Simeon son of Clopas, cousin to the Lord,'

alone sojourn in Jerusalem and not know the things which
19 are come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them,
What things? And they said unto him, The things con-
cerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in
20 deed and word before God and all the people: and how the
chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned
21 to death, and crucified him. But we hoped that it was he
which should redeem Israel. Yea and beside all this, it is now
22 the third day since these things came to pass. Moreover
certain women of our company amazed us, having been early
23 at the tomb; and when they found not his body, they came,
saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said
24 that he was alive. And certain of them that were with us
went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had
25 said: but him they saw not. And he said unto them, O foolish
men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets
26 have spoken! Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these

succeeded James as bishop of Jerusalem. 'It appears not improbable that by Cleopas is intended the father of the Lord's kinsman who was head of the Church at Jerusalem when Luke wrote' (Creed).

Dost thou alone etc. 'Are you the only pilgrim in Jerusalem who does not know...?'

19. Cp. Acts ii. 22 (Peter's speech at Pentecost), 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves know....' 'The description of Jesus is noteworthy. He is still spoken of as a man, and not yet as God, or even as a demi-god. And He is best characterised as a Prophet' (Montefiore, II, p. 636).

21. 'They had hoped that He was the Messiah, but His death has proved that this hope was an error. The Jewish form of the Christian hope is very striking in this verse' (Montefiore). The wording of *vv.* 19 and 21 shews that Luke's source here is very primitive.

Cadbury (*Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 237) says: 'The story of Emmaus is one particularly full of pathetic disappointment. "We hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel." The readers, who by a kind of dramatic irony have not "their eyes holden that they should not recognise" the third wayfarer until the breaking of bread, share nevertheless the sad face, the burning heart, the amazing report from the tomb, and the glad assurance that "the Lord is risen indeed."'

25–27. They ought to have understood that prophecy regarded 'suffering' as a necessary preliminary to 'glory' for the Messiah. And He points out to them all the passages in the O.T. which prove this. Easton describes one of the 'motives underlying the story' as the desire to shew that 'Christ originated the O.T. apologetic of the Church' (p. 362). It is clear (e.g. from Peter's speeches in Acts) that one of

things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from 27
Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in
all the scriptures the things concerning himself. And they 28
drew nigh unto the village, whither they were going: and he
made as though he would go further. And they constrained 29
him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the
day is now far spent. And he went in to abide with them.
And it came to pass, when he had sat down with them to 30
meat, he took the bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave
to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; 31
and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to 32
another, Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake

the first and most urgent tasks which the early Christians undertook was to 'search the scriptures' for prophetic confirmation of Jesus' Messiahship. To the Jews to whom they preached this was an essential preliminary to acceptance of His claim. The fact that it is the Resurrection of Jesus, not His Death, which is the theme of the early evangelists (Acts ii, iii, iv, etc.) shews that the latter did not in primitive preaching occupy anything like the central position which it has assumed in later Christian evangelistic work. It was, in fact, a stumbling-block—only gradually transformed into an asset, and eventually the central doctrine of Christianity, as study of the O.T. gave it pre-ordained and redemptive significance. Isa. liii is one of the clearest instances of such a passage.

29. 'They pressed Him,' in the punctilious politeness of ancient hospitality; and perhaps also in interest at His talk. Lagrange suggests that they took Him for a very learned Rabbi—and thus allowed Him to preside at their meal (*v.* 30). It makes the story much more natural if we suppose that the disciples (or one of them) lived at Emmaus.

30. Commentators differ in their interpretation of this verse. Some think that the writer has in mind an Eucharistic ceremony, others that he is merely describing a common meal such as Jesus must so often have shared with His disciples in the past. 'The blessing and breaking of the loaf recalls a characteristic action of Jesus in His lifetime' (Creed). The phrase in *v.* 35, 'in the breaking of the bread' (cp. Acts ii. 46), seems to have been almost a technical term for the Eucharist in the early Church; but the language of *v.* 30 is as similar to the Feeding of the Five Thousand (ix. 16) as to the Institution (xxii. 19). In any case it would be unnatural to suppose that the writer's thought and language owes nothing to the Eucharistic experience of his own day.

blessed it—rather 'blessed God for it.' The Greek word is that used by Mark and Matthew (not Luke) at the Institution, but could equally well refer to the usual Jewish grace before the meal.

32. 'We ought to have recognised Him, for only He could so have affected us' (Easton). English uses rather the word 'glow' than 'burn' in this sense.

33 to us in the way, while he opened to us the scriptures? And
they rose up that very hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and
found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with
34 them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared
35 to Simon. And they rehearsed the things *that happened* in
the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of
the bread.
36 And as they spake these things, he himself stood in the
37 midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you. But
they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they
38 beheld a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled?
39 and wherefore do reasonings arise in your heart? See my

33. Even though it is so late (*v.* 29), and they may have quite possibly already covered the distance twice that day, they set off to walk to Jerusalem with the news.

34. This abrupt mention of an appearance to Simon (i.e. presumably to Peter) is strange, for there is no other reference to it in the Gospels. It is, however, in agreement with Paul who, in 1 Cor. xv. 5, mentions first in his list of Jesus' appearances that 'He was seen of Cephas.' (Paul's next words, 'then of the twelve,' are equally in agreement with *v.* 36 f. below.) Theories of interpolation are mere conjecture.

36–end. JESUS AND THE ELEVEN

For 36–42, cp. John xx. 19 f.

36. *he himself stood in the midst of them.* Cp. 'he vanished' in *v.* 31. In Luke (and John) Jesus' 'Resurrection Body' is partly physical, partly spiritual. He appears and disappears suddenly: but is recognisable and tangible, and eats. One can see how primitive traditions of visions may have been developed in the desire for 'proofs.'

and saith unto them, Peace be unto you: omitted by some MSS. It is an interpolation from John xx. 19.

37. If this story owes its origin in any degree to apologetic, it is to the desire to shew that the risen Jesus was not *a spirit*, but flesh and blood. Lake (p. 221 f.) suggests that some of the emphasis on the materialistic nature of the risen body of Jesus is due to the desire to combat Docetism, which denied the reality of the Incarnation by distinguishing between the divine spirit of the Christ and the human Jesus in whom It dwelt. Thus the Docetic Gospel of Peter describes the death of Jesus as follows, 'And the Lord cried aloud, saying, "My power, my power, thou hast left me"; and having said this he was taken up'—leaving the body of the human Jesus on the Cross. Thus it was part of the campaign against Docetism to insist that after the Resurrection Christ was really flesh and blood—and therefore also before.

hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see;
for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having.
And when he had said this, he shewed them his hands and 40
his feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy, and won- 41
dered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat?
And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish. And he took it, 42,43
and did eat before them.

And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake 44
unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must
needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and
the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened 45
he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures;
and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ 46
should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day;
and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached 47
in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.
Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth 48,49

40. Omitted by some MSS. An interpolation from John xx. 20.

42. A.V. followed the later MSS which add 'and of an honeycomb.' This addition has never been satisfactorily explained.

44. Not a very clear sentence, but what it means is, 'what has happened now is the fulfilment of what I told you beforehand would happen.' There is truth in Montefiore's comment, 'Jesus speaks as the early preachers of Christianity spoke.'

45–46. Cp. *vv.* 26, 27 above, and notes there. But there does not seem much evidence for regarding the two passages as 'doublets': there must have been a great deal of tradition of this kind in circulation.

47. If Jesus had really laid upon His disciples with any emphasis the duty of preaching to *all* nations, as Luke here represents (cp. Matt. xxviii. 19), only one conclusion is possible: they were culpably disloyal to His orders. Acts and Paul's letters shew only too clearly the bitterness of controversy which attended the first attempts to admit Gentiles to the Church. The truth is that the words contain what the writer himself, in the knowledge and experience of his own time, believed to be the duty of the Church. 'The mission of the Church, as the Church conceived it at the close of the century, is put in the mouth of the risen Master' (Montefiore).

49. 'What was the promise referred to? One would expect a reference to something in the Gospel. If so it must be the prophecy of John the Baptist, "He shall baptise you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (cp. Acts i. 4–5). Otherwise it must be thought that the reference is to various passages in the O.T., which promised the gift of the Spirit' (Lake, p. 106). E.g., in particular, Joel ii. 28 f., 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh....' These closing verses of the Gospel are clearly

the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city,
until ye be clothed with power from on high.
50 And he led them out until *they were* over against Bethany:
51 and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came
to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them, and
52 was carried up into heaven. And they worshipped him, and
53 returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually
in the temple, blessing God.

connected with, and parallel to, Acts i. 1–11, which should be read with them.

A considerable interval has usually been assumed between the writing of the Gospel and of Acts. The following extracts are interesting as shewing the trend of modern criticism. '*Vv.* 49, 53'—in this chapter —'are so evidently meant to prepare for Acts that the latter work must have been begun as soon as the Gospel was finished, if, indeed, it was not already in preparation' (Easton, p. 366). 'The unity and continuity of Luke and Acts deserve further discussion, since it is so often assumed or dogmatically affirmed that Acts is an afterthought. The arguments that are put forward, such as the slight differences between the vocabulary of the two books and between the farewell scenes of Luke xxiv and Acts i, permit of other explanations and do not seem to counterbalance the probability that we have here the usual two-volume work with a single general preface' (Cadbury, p. 9, footnote).

but tarry ye in the city. Luke makes it clear with the greatest emphasis that the Apostles did not leave Jerusalem between the Resurrection and Ascension.

50. The story is so written as to suggest that the Ascension of Jesus took place the same night, for the words in *vv.* 46 to 49 are obviously meant for a *final* farewell. Luke could not have intended this, for in Acts i. 3 he speaks quite unhesitatingly of the 'forty days': but he does not seem to have noticed the apparent inconsistency of this brief summary. Perhaps he looked forward too eagerly to the fuller account he was going to give in vol. II of his work.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Something will be said briefly here on four points—the locality of the appearances recorded in the Gospels, the story of the Empty Tomb, the character of the appearances narrated by Luke, and the facts which underlie the tradition.

1. Luke, as we have seen, records appearances in or near Jerusalem only, and excludes the possibility of appearances in Galilee. Mark (except in the later ending) does not record any appearances, but is obviously leading up (xvi. 7) to one in Galilee. Matthew speaks of an appearance at Jerusalem to the women, and one to the Eleven in

Galilee. John tells in chapter xx of appearances at Jerusalem to the women and to the Eleven, and in chapter xxi (regarded by many as an addition to the Gospel) of an appearance in Galilee.

As a whole these two traditions are not compatible with each other. But any reconstruction of the earliest appearances of Jesus will have to take both into account. The Jerusalem tradition has been altogether rejected by some on the authority of Mark, and on the ground that it is intrinsically more probable that in their terror the disciples should have fled home to Galilee; something, therefore, must have happened in Galilee to bring them back again to Jerusalem. When Jerusalem became the centre of Christian activity, the Galilean tradition was obscured and forgotten. The Galilean tradition has also been altogether rejected on the ground that as a matter of historical fact the Christian Church was born not in Galilee but in Jerusalem, although far the greater part of Jesus' own Ministry had taken place in Galilee. Moreover there is nothing to explain this in Matthew and Mark, which speak of Galilean appearances, but leave the Apostles still in Galilee. (Arguments on either side will be found in Lake, p. 206 f., Rawlinson, pp. 270–1, *HDCG*, art. 'Resurrection of Christ.') The evidence seems better accounted for by a middle view. The details must remain obscure; but even if it is necessary to conclude that the Apostles, or most of them, remained near Jerusalem and 'saw' Jesus there, there is no reason why some of them, or other Galilean disciples, should not have 'seen' Him also in Galilee. The tradition of Galilean appearances is then accounted for, if much confused in transmission.

2. It is an ironic commentary upon the course of history that the story of the Empty Tomb, which owes its preservation (if not its origin) to the fact that among the early Christians it was regarded as the strongest evidence for the Resurrection, should to many modern minds be the element in the narrative least easily credible.

'That the tomb was empty was undoubtedly the general belief of the earliest Christians' (Lake). But it must be remembered that the Jewish idea of resurrection was almost certainly such as to imply a resurrection *of the body*—if transformed or 'glorified'—i.e. that the material body would not be left in the grave. The fact that the tomb of Jesus was empty on the third day would therefore have been an inevitable inference from the fact of His Resurrection (established by His appearances). That an inference of this kind should in a short time become a proof of that from which it was inferred, will not seem incredible to those who are familiar with the conditions of the development of Christian tradition in the first century.

The modern mind cannot accept the idea of a bodily resurrection for humanity. The future life is viewed as a spiritual, not a physical existence: in which personality, not the physical organism, survives. Apart therefore from any question of the miraculous, the story of the Empty Tomb seems unnecessary, inconsequent, even crude: in Lake's words, 'an improper inference from the fact of the Resurrection.' [On this view the story of the women's visit may either be itself regarded as simply an 'inference' without historical foundation: or, if historical itself, as having led through misunderstanding or accident to the mis-

taken inference that the tomb was empty. A suggestion on this latter view will be found in Lake, p. 250 f.]

3. On this point it is not necessary to do more than to summarise shortly what has been said in the notes. In both the appearances of which Luke tells, stress is laid upon the physical reality of Jesus' risen body, although it is not subject to the ordinary limitations of humanity. There is little in this tendency—born of the desire of later generations to prove the reality of the first disciples' experiences—which commends itself to the modern mind.

It seems probable that the Emmaus story—of which no critic can deny the artistic beauty—has at least some foundation in a real experience. The name Emmaus is not known to have any special significance or association such as would make it the focus of entirely unfounded tradition. But, as we have seen, the O.T. apologetic and Eucharistic experience of the Christian Church have played their part in the development of the story. The other story, similar to, but less developed than, the one in John xx, does not carry special conviction. The words attributed to Jesus seem to be a 'reading back' of the Church's later experience and ideals.

4. The existence of the Church is undoubtedly the best evidence for the Resurrection. No other cause can so adequately explain the transformation of the disciples' despair into joy and confident activity as the assurance that He whom they had seen dying on the Cross was with them still. But very divergent views may be held as to the *manner* in which that assurance was reached. Enough has been said above to shew the difficulty of the view that what the disciples 'saw' was the human body of Jesus, reanimated and removed from the grave. But if this be abandoned, and the appearances described as 'spiritual,' there still remains the choice whether they are to be regarded as purely subjective, having their origin in the minds of the disciples themselves: or as in any sense objective, the result of some external cause independent of the disciples. Into the decision between these alternatives many considerations, both psychological and philosophic, will enter which are beyond the scope of a commentary. On this point the Gospels themselves can give no help. It may simply be added that no decision will be satisfactory which does not adequately satisfy the witness of the N.T. to the force and rapidity with which the belief in the Resurrection arose among the disciples and reacted on the world.

APPENDIX I

JESUS AND HIS PEOPLE

On the death of Herod the Great in 4 B.C. his territories were divided among his sons, Archelaus receiving Judaea, Idumaea and Samaria, Antipas (the 'Herod' of Jesus' Ministry) Galilee and Peraea, and Philip territory in the north-east of Palestine. In A.D. 6, as the result of complaints to Augustus by his subjects, Archelaus was deposed by the Romans, and his territory administered henceforth by a Roman 'Procurator' under the control of the 'Legate' of the Roman province of Syria. How much power remained to the high priest and Sanhedrin is doubtful; they had certainly lost the power of the death penalty.

The Jews had known no real independence since the Captivity. Subject to a succession of foreign over-lords, Persia, Greece, Egypt, Syria, Rome, with varying degrees of peace or persecution according to the temper of the time, the Jewish community had found an outlet for its energy and aspirations in religious rather than political activity. The rule of the Law had gradually strengthened its hold over the nation. Yet to the Jew religion and politics could never be separated: and while on the one hand deepening devotion to the Law and insistence upon tradition was the mark of a people whose political circumstances forbade progressive thought and action, and made them turn inwards upon the glories of their own past; yet on the other an undercurrent of fanatical patriotism was always flowing, which issued in constant intrigue and frequent rebellion. Jehovah's sovereignty must be vindicated from the insult of heathen rule. In the second century B.C. the Maccabaean revolt restored for a time a considerable degree of national independence. Under the influence of success the current of fanatical patriotism flowed more and more strongly and from it issued the Pharisees of later times, with their intense love of God, the Law and their country. The first century B.C. brought civil strife, Pompey's conquest in 63, and renewed bitterness and unrest under the Roman governors and Herod the Great.

Such was the historical background of Jesus' time. Three vital elements in His life and teaching can only be understood in their relation to it—His attitude to the religion of His day, His Messianic consciousness or claim, and His eschatological thought. The two latter can conveniently be discussed together.

JESUS' ATTITUDE TO JUDAISM

The word 'Pharisaic' in English to-day implies all that is contemptible and false. From an uncritical reading of the Gospels, moreover, such a use of the word might seem to be justified. The Pharisees in the Gospels are not attractive, and Jesus deals with them severely enough. It is quite clear, however, that the Gospels do not present a fair picture

of contemporary Jewish religion. Christian commentators have been slow to admit this. To many of them, as to the writer of the First Gospel (Matt. xxii. 35: contrast Mark xii. 28 f.), a sincere Pharisee seems to have appeared a contradiction in terms. Gradually, however, study of Gospel origins and greater knowledge of the Jews from sources outside the Gospels have enabled a truer estimate to be made. It is natural that those who opposed Jesus should figure most prominently in the Gospels. Controversy is more interesting than acquiescence. The infant Christian Church, moreover, suffered violent persecution from the Jews just at the time when the traditions which form the material of our Gospels were taking shape in oral repetition. Resentment at this had a twofold effect upon the tradition. Sayings or events favourable to Jewish religion of Jesus' time would be dropped or altered, those unfavourable to it heightened or even invented. Nor did this resentment pass when Christianity became independent of the Jewish Church and Jewish persecution ceased. Christians were not slow to interpret the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 as God's judgement upon the nation's rejection of Christ, and the prevailing temper towards Judaism cannot but have had its effect upon the final editors of our Gospels.

Since the days of Amos and Isaiah two lines of thought, ultimately discordant, had been evident in Jewish religion: the prophetic, with its thunderous emphasis upon morality and its distrust of ceremonial religion, and the priestly or institutional. Jesus was in the prophetic line. Since the time of the older prophets, moreover, the Mosaic Law had come to be universally accepted as perfect and authoritative, and upon it had been built a sharply defined system of ceremonial religion. It was inevitable that Jesus should clash with this. What is more, it was inevitable, perhaps, that He should not view even the best in it with much sympathy, that His perception of its worth should be somewhat blurred, His condemnation of its weakness somewhat exaggerated.

When allowance has been made for all this, when it is realised that much discrimination must be used in estimating the truth of the picture of Jewish religion which our Gospels give, the weakness of some elements, at least, in contemporary Judaism are clearly seen. Undue prominence may be given in the Gospels to the more rigid elements; what is condemned may have been partial and not universal; its weakness may be exaggerated: yet there was pressing need for a prophet to give new life and a truer sense of proportion. The old prophets had said that the outward forms of worship were of little value; inward religion and moral goodness alone can avail. Jesus takes up their mantle, but times have changed. It is no longer the sacrifices of the sanctuaries that are the snares of merely outward religion, but laws of the sabbath and cleanliness and food.

On the one hand, the Jewish conception of the One God who was also peculiarly the God of the Jews had led, at the time of Jesus, to exclusiveness and pride and contempt for other people. The Jews were God's special servants, they must keep themselves holy, separate from all other nations. Thus, alongside of noble earnestness to do God's

will and to be faithful and pure, there appeared self-righteousness and arrogance, not only towards foreigners but also towards Jews who were lax or unorthodox. Such men were not to be helped, but avoided.

On the other hand, the view that the observance of the Law was an end in itself and would bring its own reward, the sole and God-given path to happiness and salvation; that, moreover, the Law was all equally perfect, each ordinance and command the perfect expression of the perfect will of God;—this view led to formalism and insincerity. The moral laws of reverence, kindness and sexual purity lifted the Jews, in Jesus' time as in earlier days, far above the moral level of their neighbours. Yet the ceremonial laws, concerned with sabbaths and other festivals, food and cooking, tenths and other dues, cleanness and uncleanness of an outward kind, were a fatally easy path to quite false conceptions of religion. Hypocrisy and outward self-righteousness; the idea of goodness as on the one hand negative, on the other consisting of a number of separate ceremonial actions rather than noble character; the view of man's relation to God as a contract dependent upon fear and what is due, rather than a devotion inspired by love and free forgiveness; the idea of sin as 'non-conformity to a number of commands rather than a pollution of the soul';—all these merited, and justly, Jesus' bitter indignation.

[The words in inverted commas in the last paragraph are from an article in *Peake's Commentary*, 'Contemporary Jewish Religion,' by Dr C. G. Montefiore. This article, and the same writer's fuller treatment of the subject in his *Synoptic Gospels* (vol. I, Introduction, section 24 f.), may be very highly recommended. Dr Montefiore is a Liberal Jew, whose writings have done much to vindicate contemporary Judaism from the condemnation of early Christianity, while at the same time frankly admitting its defects and Jesus' prophetic greatness. *The People and the Book*, edited by A. S. Peake (Oxford, 1925), is an admirable study of Jewish history and religion.]

The 'Pharisees and scribes,' then,—so familiar a combination in the Gospels—were the leaders and teachers of what Montefiore calls 'the conforming members of the established church' in Jesus' day, the great majority of the total population. The name 'Pharisees' means 'separated,' and in varying degree the Pharisees exhibited both the strength and weakness, such as has been described above, of this conscious 'separation unto God.' The scribes or Rabbis—most of them Pharisees, but not all apparently (Mark ii. 16; Luke v. 30)—were the students and expositors of the Law. Study of the Law and interpretation of it to the people became more and more necessary, after the Exile, as the rule of the Law asserted itself. The scribes' profession came to be held in high honour. They acted as students, teachers and judges. They devoted themselves to making the Law fit every possible situation of human life; they handed on 'this tradition of the elders' orally to their pupils; and they took a leading part, in the Sanhedrin and local courts, in the practical administration of the Law. In its origin their work was essential and good; men must know what the Law enjoined, in this or that circumstance of life. By the time of Jesus some of them at least had completely lost sight of the

wood for the trees, annulled the spirit of the Law by their tradition, and bound burdens on men's backs that could not be borne.

The origin of the name 'Sadducees' is doubtful. They were the priestly aristocracy of the nation in whose hands, from the time of Alexander the Great, had been the whole conduct of political affairs. Their aims were political rather than religious. Their close contact with foreigners and their desire to further the welfare of the Jews as a secular state brought them into strong opposition to the nationalistic Pharisees. At the time of Jesus they were few in number and their power had lessened, for the mass of the people followed the Pharisaic ideal. They still held the high religious offices, under the fickle acquiescence of Rome, and were, broadly speaking, pro-Roman and pro-Herod. Their wish to maintain the established position made them generally conservative. They did not want either new doctrine—such as resurrection—or new political moves.

Of the 'Herodians' we know nothing beyond what the name implies. They are upholders of the native monarchy, not in any way a religious 'party,' but simply Herod's agents and functionaries, perhaps aiming at the restoration of Herodian rule in Judaea as well as in Galilee. The 'Zealots' have been supposed to be a definite sect, at Jesus' time, of extreme patriots. But there is no evidence for their existence before A.D. 66, when Josephus gives the word as the name of the followers of a certain John of Gischala. The name 'Zealot,' as applied to Simon, one of the Twelve, is therefore best regarded simply as a nickname given to him by reason of either his religious fervour or personal character (see *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. I, Pt. I, Appendix A: chapter III in this book, 'Varieties of Thought and Practice in Judaism,' is excellent).

With regard to comparison between Jesus' teaching and the Rabbinic teaching of the period, the question at issue is not whether isolated parallels can be found to this or that saying of Jesus—as is undoubtedly the case—but of the comparative level of what is *characteristic* in Jesus and the Rabbis. There is no reason to believe that the best ethical teaching of the Rabbis did not enunciate principles little, if at all, less noble than those of Jesus. Jesus' passion for the sinner's rescue, however, and His teaching of the supreme duty of seeking out and redeeming the fallen, was something new in its consistent and urgent vehemence. So also, of course, is His bold vindication of *inward* religion as the only religion worth having. Even if the best Rabbinic teaching from time to time allowed, or even emphasised, this truth, it is not at all *characteristic* of Rabbinic teaching.

JESUS' MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS AND ESCHATOLOGICAL THOUGHT

Montefiore describes Jesus' Messianic consciousness as 'the biggest problem of the gospel story.' Did Jesus believe Himself to be Messiah? If so, was the belief present to Him from the beginning, or did it come to Him gradually? In what sense Messiah—a king, or a spiritual leader, or both? Was His kingdom to be earthly, or 'heavenly'—in the new age to come? When would it be set up? What was His own

relation to God—was He as Messiah 'more than man,' in some special sense 'Son of God'? Such are some of the questions involved. They cannot be easily answered, for the Gospel data are meagre and capable of very different interpretation.

First, a summary of Jewish thought about the Messiah must be attempted. Even here the way is not easy, for it is necessary to distinguish between what was current before or at the time of Jesus, and what came after Him. It may indeed be held that the view of Jewish Messianic conceptions so widespread in popular Christian thought—as narrowly exclusive and materialistic—is a misrepresentation arising from just such a confusion. The student who wishes to pursue the subject further should read sections I and IV of the first volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, together with Montefiore, vol. I, pp. cxxi–cxxxiii, 10 f., 180 f., and 355 f.

For the general background of Messianic thought one must look to those many passages in the Old Testament which speak of Jehovah's rule over the whole earth, and that future national blessedness which the 'day of Jehovah' will introduce. There is not here, in general, any conception of a Messiah: the expectation centres upon the rule of Jehovah Himself. In the earliest period, down to about the eighth century, this future was to be a period of material prosperity achieved through the overthrow of Israel's enemies—a conception which proceeded naturally enough from the very limited view of Jehovah as Israel's national God and no more. It is non-ethical; the coming of the 'day of Jehovah' depended rather upon due performance of ritual and sacrifice than upon the national morality.

The great prophets of the eighth century, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, with their noble conception of Jehovah as the moral ruler of the whole world, gave 'Jehovah's day' a new meaning. It is to be a day of judgement, for Israel as well as for other nations—and for Israel with special severity in virtue of her privileged position: 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore will I visit upon you all your iniquities' (Amos iii. 2). The rule of Jehovah will be founded on righteousness; all evil will be purged from his kingdom. There is still no Messiah, and the kingdom is not apparently world-wide. Zephaniah (7th cent.) makes the judgement universal: the nations generally will be destroyed, and the righteous people of Israel will be left. The prophets of the Exile, as was natural when the Israelite State had practically ceased to exist, stressed the individual character of the judgement. The day of Jehovah will mete out individual retribution, and as the result of this purging a new and better Israel will enter the Messianic kingdom. Ezekiel speaks of the Messiah as a king like David.

Jeremiah had spoken of the conversion of the heathen nations, though Ezekiel had refused to admit the possibility of their entrance into the kingdom. The noble prophet of the Exile who is known as the Second Isaiah (Isa. xl f.) strikes a higher note still in the 'Servant Songs' (xlii. 1–4, xlix. 1–6, l. 4–9, lii. 13–liii. 12); if, as is probable, the 'Servant of Jehovah' is the righteous remnant of Israel, the writer thinks of the nation's function as essentially a missionary one. Jehovah

has laid a special commission upon them, to bring all men to worship Him. This shall be the fruit of the nation's suffering. [It is essential that these 'Servant' passages should be studied in detail with a good modern commentary. Whatever their exact original significance they are immensely interesting, not only because of the influence they may have exerted on the thought of Jesus Himself, but for their bold grasp, remarkable at such a date, of the principle of the redemptive value of suffering.]

After the Exile thought narrows again. The Jews were hard put to it to maintain themselves in Palestine, the rebuilding of the Temple was but sluggishly undertaken and spasmodically carried on, Judaism became rigid and exclusive in its efforts to avoid contamination and hand its system on to posterity. The post-exilic prophets, therefore, speak of the irrevocable destruction of all other nations: and merge into apocalyptic thought, in which it is not the moral reformation of the nation, but a sudden divine intervention, that will bring the kingdom into being.

'Daniel' (168/167 B.C.) looks forward to a sudden intervention of this kind, at the moment when evil in the world has reached its climax. The throne of judgement will be set up, the world-powers overthrown, the faithful will receive the kingdom, and the righteous dead will rise to share it with them. The book of Daniel stands near the beginning of what is known as the 'Apocalyptic' literature of the second and first century B.C. and first century A.D. 'The origin of Apocalyptic,' says Dr Charles, 'is to be sought in prophecy, or rather, indeed, in unfulfilled prophecy' (*Eschatology*, 1st ed., p. 168). Events which have been foretold do not come to pass in spite of long delay, and the prophecies about them are interpreted anew in such a way as to shew that their fulfilment is still in the future. Jeremiah had promised the Messianic kingdom after seventy years; Daniel interprets the 70 years as 70 weeks of years, i.e. 490 years. (Somewhat similar methods appear to be characteristic of British Israelites to-day!) The Maccabees achieved an independent kingdom—but a kingdom far removed from the promised kingdom of God. Henceforward the earthly kingdom is viewed as merely temporary—the real reign of God will be in another sphere. 'Prophecy still believes that this world is God's world, and that in His world His goodness and truth will yet be justified.... The apocalyptic writer, on the other hand, almost wholly despairs of the present; his main interests are supermundane' (*op. cit.* p. 174). Apocalyptic does not, as prophecy does, see the future as arising naturally from the present: there is to be a complete break—in fact it is only after the darkest hour that the dawn will come. All has been determined from the beginning in the counsels of God, and must be worked out to the end: man has no share in the moulding of history. Apocalyptic is the language of despair. Subject as she had been for centuries to the sway of one or other of the great world-powers, the present world had no hope for Israel. God alone could save by breaking into history and bringing the world order to an end. At the same time the doctrine of personal immortality, almost wholly absent from pre-exilic writings, begins to develop.

It is not necessary here to summarise the ideas of the apocalyptic documents individually. A full account of them—Daniel, Aethiopic Enoch, Sibylline Oracles, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs of the second century B.C., though parts of them merge into the next century; 1 Maccabees, Judith, Psalms of Solomon, 2 Maccabees of the first century B.C.; the Book of Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, the Book of Wisdom, Slavonic Enoch, 4 Maccabees, Baruch, 4 Ezra of the first century A.D.—will be found in Dr Charles' *Eschatology*, 1st ed., chapters V–VIII, or, more shortly, in the same writer's *Between the Testaments* (Home and University Library). The dates assigned to the documents are in several cases very doubtful. The course of thought about the Messiah and his kingdom is, according to Dr Charles, as follows:

In the second century B.C. the Messiah himself is hardly mentioned. The kingdom is sometimes thought of as to be on earth, sometimes the present world is felt to be unfit for it. The kingdom is to last for ever. The Gentiles are to have the chance of being converted.

In the first century B.C. the idea of an eternal kingdom on earth is completely given up. The earth is wholly unfit for the presence of God. Happiness will be eternally realised in the blessed immortality of heaven itself. Some writers speak of the Messianic kingdom, therefore, as merely temporary, others regard it as to be established on a transformed, a 'new' earth. During this century the Messiah becomes almost universally the chief figure in the kingdom; but two different conceptions of the Messiah are found. On the one hand, the writer of that part of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch which is known as the 'Similitudes of Enoch' pictures him as a supernatural being, applying to him such titles as 'the Righteous One,' 'He in whom Wisdom dwells,' 'the Elect One,' 'the Anointed' (=Christ), and, especially, 'the Son of Man.' [The Messiah is first described in Enoch, much as in Daniel, as 'one whose face was as the appearance of a man'—afterwards simply as 'the (or 'that') Son of Man.' From these writers is derived, no doubt, the frequent use of the phrase in the Gospels.] On the other hand such a writer as that of the 'Psalms of Solomon' strongly revives the conception of the Messiah as the Davidic king, who will destroy the ungodly nation and 'rule a mighty people and a holy.' His kingdom is to be earthly, but temporary. In nearly all these first-century writings nothing awaits the Gentiles but annihilation.

For our present purpose not much need be said about the eschatology of the first century A.D. It should be noticed, however, how great was the effect of the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Before it much the same diverse conceptions persisted as in the century before. 'Although the restoration of the nation under a Davidic prince as foretold in the Scriptures was firmly believed in, it does not seem to have much engaged the thought of the rabbis. To the prophets, whose announcement that it was at hand made a commotion from time to time among the multitude, they turned a deaf ear. They opposed all attempts to expedite the deliverance by insurrection. It would come in God's time and way. Meanwhile their task was to prepare the people for it by

expounding and inculcating the will of God for righteousness as He had revealed it in the Law. The fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 completely changed this attitude. Messianic prophecy assumed an instant and engrossing importance, and inevitably its political aspect was dominant in men's minds' (*Beginnings*, vol. I, pp. 359–60)—the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the destruction of Rome.

As a conclusion to this summary another paragraph from the same source may be quoted: 'It must be borne in mind that in a large part of the prophecies in the O.T. foretelling and describing a golden age to come, the political element which is characteristic of what may properly be called Messianic prophecy is wholly absent. Not the restoration of the Kingdom of Judah under the reign of a descendant of David, but the universal reign of the God of Israel, whose unity and sovereignty are acknowledged by all mankind, and whose righteous will is law for all, was the end of God's ways in history for the prophets of oecumenic vision. In Jewish thought and hope at the beginning of our era this universal reign of God with all that it implied—the universality of the true religion, world-wide peace in righteousness—filled a large place. This is the "Kingdom of Heaven" of which we read in the Gospels. "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," is not a prayer for the coming of the Messiah; and in the Jewish liturgy prayers for the appearance of the scion or son of David are quite distinct from those for the "Kingdom"—the reign of God. Doubtless in the common apprehension the national political hope was associated with this larger outlook; but in the minds of the teachers of the people in the generation before the fall of Jerusalem, it seems to have been incidental to it, and assuredly did not so fill their thoughts as to exclude the greater future' (p. 357).

It has been pointed out at the beginning of this section what injustice may be done to Jewish thought by identifying the whole of Messianic belief and hope with those somewhat narrowly political aspirations current after Jerusalem had fallen. Christian commentators have not been over-scrupulous in the matter. A representation of Jewish Messianic conceptions as narrowly political and materialistic has not infrequently served as the foundation for argument either that Jesus certainly did not think of Himself as Messiah, or that if He did, it was in quite a new sense—His conceptions of Messiahship were solely spiritual, and therefore un-Jewish. It is perfectly natural to suppose that Jesus here, as elsewhere, worked out for Himself a new conception by rejecting some and accepting other elements in current thought, and by adding something new of His own. In this, as in all His teaching, what is spiritual would predominate to a greater degree, no doubt, than was the case in contemporary thought: but this is not to say that contemporary thought was wholly unspiritual, or that because it was not wholly spiritual Jesus would have nothing to do with it.

Some answer may now be attempted to the questions given above. That Jesus never, in any sense, either thought Himself to be, or claimed to be, Messiah is most unlikely. Not only does such a view do violence to even a moderate estimate of the Gospels' historical value, but it

makes almost unintelligible a number of facts which must be taken into account however radically the Gospel story is handled. Why, for instance, if He regarded Himself as prophet or rabbi, in no sense national leader or saviour, did Jesus make His last appeal to the nation at Jerusalem? Why did He die, in fact, if not asserting, at least refusing to deny, His Messiahship? If not implanted in any degree by Jesus Himself, whence came to the disciples' minds that belief in Jesus as the 'Christ of God' which made possible their resurrection faith and its far-reaching consequences?

The Gospels themselves suggest that before Peter's answer at Caesarea Philippi Jesus had never spoken of Himself as Messiah to even His most intimate friends. Even then He treats it as something that must not be talked of to others. Neither before nor after did the people in general think of Him as Messiah; He was different from what they had expected. Some of them may have thought that He would perhaps turn out to be Messiah in the end. Whether to Jesus Himself His Baptism and Temptation meant, at the very outset, a realisation of Himself as Messiah, or, less definitely, a sense of prophetic mission and 'sonship,' must remain doubtful. It would be natural that His 'Messianic consciousness' should come to Him gradually, as He grew to know more of God, and as His faith flickered or burnt high.

In what sense, then, did Jesus regard His Messiahship? At present certainty is impossible, and it is unlikely that more data will ever be available. It is wiser, therefore, as has been suggested above, to take the view that while He rejected some and altered others, Jesus accepted many of the elements of current Messianic thought. Jesus' conception of the Kingdom was, needless to say, religious rather than political: yet He cannot have believed that when that Kingdom came it would be a Roman one. He would not share Jewish hopes of rebellion against Rome: yet He must have believed that Rome's overthrow would inevitably come to pass when God established His Kingdom. Like the Prophets before Him, no doubt Jesus believed that many Gentiles would enter the Kingdom: yet they would enter it only as adherents to the true faith of Judaism. Jesus did not feel the dominion of Rome as burdensome as the yoke of Priests and Rabbis; yet the coming of the Kingdom would certainly put an end to both. If, then, He regarded Himself as the Davidic Messiah, He did so in a sense which differed very considerably from popular conceptions on the matter.

That Jesus believed that the Kingdom would be set up by a catastrophic intervention of God in the immediate future, and that He Himself would return as the supernatural 'Son of Man,' is a fact of New Testament interpretation, long neglected, but now definitely established through the work of Schweitzer and his 'eschatological' school of critics. In this He was a child of His age, His vision limited by the horizons of His time. In some respects—e.g. on wealth—His teaching may have been affected by this outlook. Yet this does not mean that Jesus was merely a 'firebrand fanatic'—His teaching a makeshift system of ethics for a dying world. Right is right, and wrong wrong, in this world and the next. Apocalyptic proclaims the

supremacy of the eternal values of truth, beauty and goodness, and the inevitability of judgement by their standard. Such conceptions were the very foundation of Jesus' moral and religious outlook: what more natural than that He should accept without questioning the belief that when once the chosen people shewed themselves spiritually prepared God would declare the victory of goodness by such a judgement? This is not to say, of course, that Jesus necessarily accepted in detail the ideas of the apocalyptic writers. There is much that He must have rejected in their views of God's nature, as well as in their pictures of heaven and hell and mankind's destiny.

When they speak of Jesus as 'Son of God,' the Gospels—except perhaps in their earliest strata—plainly take it for granted that He was more than man, a supernatural being of supernatural origin and power; thus expressing the thought of later first-century Christianity. To a Jew of Jesus' time, however, the phrase 'Son of God' would naturally be used of the Messiah. Israel itself is Jehovah's 'son': so also in a special sense is Israel's true representative and anointed king. That Jesus regarded Himself as divine or semi-divine is most improbable. If others applied the title 'Son of God' to Him during His lifetime, or if He applied it to Himself, it was doubtless in this more restricted sense. He was conscious—uniquely conscious—of a special relationship between Himself and God; but it was the relationship of a son to a father, of a prophet to the source of his inspiration, rather than of one who felt himself in any sense on an equality with God. 'Why callest thou Me good? There is none good, save One, that is God.' He was God's Servant through whom—through whose suffering, if need be,—the Kingdom of God would come.

APPENDIX II

THE WRITER OF THE GOSPEL

Luke's only appearance in the N.T. is in the letters of Paul. Col. iv. 14 describes him as 'the beloved physician.' Paul is writing from imprisonment, and Luke is with him. In 2 Tim. iv. 11 are the words 'Only Luke is with me.' Apart from this, and the evidence of the 'We-sections' in Acts, all that we may know about him must be inferred from his writings. From the way in which he is mentioned in Colossians he is apparently a Gentile. The evidence of the 'We-sections' has been held to suggest that his home was at Philippi.

It is well to remember, at the outset, how uncertain must be inferences from works like the Gospel and Acts with regard to the personality of their author. Cadbury quotes some amusing sentences from a German theologian written in 1864: 'Luke, who is introduced to us by the N.T. not merely as a D.D., but as an M.D., has now further conferred upon him by —— an LL.D., so that the Faculty of Law shall have claim to his insignia. That Luke must have been not only

an attorney, but also a very good one, he says may be concluded from his writings. All that Luke now lacks is the Ph.D. hood, which, forsooth, he can probably get without much trouble' (*Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 220 n.). The evidence afforded by such short works must necessarily be limited, inferences therefore being often dependent upon a single word or phrase; our limited knowledge of the religious and social background makes their interpretation all the more uncertain; in many cases we cannot tell whether what we infer concerns Luke or some earlier editor. All such inferences, moreover, must be highly subjective, according to our own temperament and outlook. With this caveat what follows may perhaps be useful in suggesting lines of approach.

Luke shares Paul's interest in Gentile Christians, and in O.T. passages that foretell Gentile conversion. He is interested in, and apparently not prejudiced against, Samaritans; he knows something of, and frequently refers to, the Herods and their household; he has wide contacts with the life of the Mediterranean world and its political background, its law and its authorities; he writes, says Cadbury, 'from the urban standpoint,' with interest throughout in what happens in 'the city'; he represents Jesus as the Saviour of the Gentiles who accepted Him, and emphasises His rejection by the Jews. Yet he is unexpectedly 'non-Pauline,' in the sense that he does not introduce any of the more developed theology of Paul's letters, or use Paul's basic terms, such as 'justification,' 'faith,' 'grace,' 'salvation,' in any technical way. This has been variously explained. Perhaps Luke did not come into prolonged contact with Paul until his own faith had been formed in its own way. Perhaps it is because the controversies which called forth Paul's aggressive theology were past at the time when Luke was writing, and Paul's teaching has become the common background of Gentile Christianity, so that its fundamentals no longer need emphasis because they are taken for granted. Perhaps it is because he is not much interested in abstract theology, except when it is essential to the history he is writing.

In the religious teaching of what he writes there is emphasis on prayer, on cheerfulness, and on the Spirit. He frequently represents Jesus as praying at a crisis, and the Apostles similarly in Acts; he gives more of Jesus' teaching on prayer than the other evangelists. The word 'joy' is one of his favourites; the atmosphere in Acts is triumphantly joyous, life is brighter for the Christians than for other folk—how he would have hated the 'pious gloom' of much of later Christianity! In the Gospel many of his parables end on a note of joy —God's joy at man's redemption, man's joy at God's mercy. There is the delightful arrogance of Acts—'we and the Holy Spirit decided,' and in both books men are constantly conscious of God's nearness to them through the Spirit's activity. Yet it can hardly be said that Luke is unusual in emphasising these elements. They were characteristic of the Christianity he knew—perhaps even more so of the earliest Christianity with which his history deals.

Luke has no theory of Atonement, even less, it has been observed, than Mark, for he omits Mark's 'ransom for many' and the similar

phrase at the Last Supper. What he gives in the speeches of the earlier part of Acts agrees with what we may conjecture to have been the elements of the first Christian apologetic—all the emphasis is on the Resurrection of Jesus, His death almost a difficulty, needing explanation, and only gradually, through the influence of prophecy, to take its place in the positive teaching. On the basis of the Resurrection Jesus is to Luke both Messiah and King of the Jews. Luke is not afraid of miracle: in fact, he seems to prefer the more miraculous of two versions of an incident. He underlines the miracle at Jesus' Baptism by adding 'in a bodily form' to his description of the Spirit, and prefers to the account of Peter's call which Mark gives the more elaborate story which includes the miraculous catch of fish. He shares the apocalyptic outlook of his age. He emphasises over and over again the need for repentance in view of the Lord's return. Perhaps in two respects Luke's eschatology is advancing from that of the earlier Synoptists to the Fourth Gospel's position. The earliest generation of Christians looked for the Lord's return in the immediate future; in some instances Luke seems to be lengthening the perspective—the end is not yet. Sometimes too he suggests that the Spirit's coming fulfils in part the expectation of the Kingdom.

So much for his 'theology.' Some of the general characteristics of his Gospel are well known—perhaps indeed exaggerated. He can tell a story extremely well. Dramatic contrast, pathos, vivid character-sketching, the dramatic value of suspense, make his Gospel as a whole interesting and attractive—more so than Mark or Matthew, certainly, for the modern reader; and some of the stories it contains—the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, Martha and Mary—are famous throughout the world. How much of this is due to Luke himself it is hard to say. The evidence of Acts suggests that most of it is his.

He shares to the full, and perhaps even carries further, Jesus' bitter indignation against superficial and snobbish religion, selfish wealth and self-complacent righteousness. This gives him a special tenderness towards the religious outcast, the poor and the sinful. Perhaps he was himself happily married—why is it always assumed that Peter is the only Gospel character to have acquired a mother-in-law, and in any case, as he is an Apostle, the less said about her the better? At any rate there is what has been called 'a domestic tone' about his Gospel. He seems at home when speaking of family life, and has no hesitation in allowing women to play a full part in his story.

When all this is said we know little enough of the real Luke. Yet our gratitude to him for his portrait of Jesus may be all the greater for what he reveals of himself.

INDEX

Angels, 4, 232
Anna, 22f.
Annas, 27
Annunciation, the, 6f., 21, 25
Anointing, the, 74f.
Apocalyptic, 139f., 179f., 215f., 262f.
Apocryphal gospels, the, 23
Apostles, the, 57f.
Atonement, the, 247

Barabbas, 241
Bartholomew, 58
Beatitudes, the, 60f.
Beelzebub, 122
Benedictus, the, 12f.
Bethsaida Julias, 92
Betrayal of Jesus, the, 222
Betrothal, 6
Blasphemy, 134f.
Brothers of Jesus, the, 39, 82
'Bush,' the, 212

Caiaphas, 27
Centurion at Capernaum, the, 67f.
Childlikeness, 104, 184
Children, 184
Children's games, 73f.
Christmas Day, 18
Chronological order, 2
Chronology of N.T., the, 26, 27
Chuza, 78
Circumcision, 11, 12
'Clearing' of the Temple, the, 202f.
Command for silence, the, 95f.
Corner-stone, the, 207
Criticism of the Gospels, viif.
Crucifixion, 243

Daemonic possession, 41f., 74, 78
Davidic Messiah, the, 212f.
Denarius, 76, 134

Devil, the, 35
Divorce, Jesus' teaching on, 171f.
Docetism, 254

Elijah, 91, 99
Elizabeth, 10
Emmaus, 251f.
Enrolment, the, 14f.
Erasmus, viii
Eschatology, 262f.
Eternal life, 114
Exorcism, 104, 122

Faith, 137f.
Fasting, 51f.
Five thousand fed, 91f.
Form-Criticism, xiiif.
Future life, the, 172f., 210f.

Gadarene swine, the, 83f.
Gehenna, 133
Gethsemane, 231f.
God's justice, 163
'Good will,' 19
'Great Omission,' the, 94

Healing at a distance, 68
Herod Antipas, 14f., 27, 78, 91, 148f., 207f., 239f.
Herod the Great, 259
Herodians, the, 207, 262
Humility, 151f., 183f., 228
Hypocrites, 142, 145f.

James, 58
Jerusalem's fate, 201, 210
Jesus' ancestry, 32f.
Jesus and Judaism, 53, 127f., 259f.
Jesus and politics, 210
Jesus and the sabbath, 54f.
Jesus' anger, 56
Jesus as Messiah, 69f. 266f.
Jesus at Jerusalem, 23f.

Jesus at Nazareth, 37f.
Jesus' Baptism, 31f.
Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, 197f.
Jesus' humour, 65, 117
Jesus' knowledge of His Resurrection, 96
Jesus' sinlessness, 185f.
Jesus' Temptation, 34f.
Jewish religion, 259f.
John, Gospel of, 112f.
John the Baptist, 26f., 69f., 169, 204
Jonah, 124f.
Josephus, 30
'Journey to Jerusalem,' the, 105
Judas the Gaulonite, 25
Judas Iscariot, 58, 221f.

Kingdom of God, the, 43f., 141, 263f.

Last Supper, the, 224f.
Lazarus, 172f.
Leaven, 132, 146f.
Legend, 3
Legion, 85
Leprosy, 46
Levi, 50
Lord's Prayer, the, 118f.
Luke, authorship of, xvif.
Luke, date of, xviiif., 218
Luke, medical language of, xviii
Luke, sources of, xixf.
Luke's outlook and style, 269f.
Luke's peculiar matter, xxiiif.
Luke's relation to Matthew, xii
Luke's use of Mark, xi, xix
Luke's use of 'Q,' xx
Lysanias, 27

Maccabees, 259
Machaerus, 31
Magdala, 77
Magnificat, the, 10f.
Mammon, 166
Manger, the, 18
Mark, priority of, xi
Mary and Martha, 116f.
Matthew's use of Mark, xi
Messiahship of Jesus, 69f., 266f.
Messianic hopes, 14, 20, 69f., 266f.
Miracles of Jesus, the, 41f.
Miraculous Conception, the, 6f., 8f., 21, 25, 33, 39
Mission of the Seventy, the, 108f.
Mission of the Twelve, the, 89f.
Money, 134, 208
Mustard, 146

Nain, 68f.
Name, power of the, 85
Nazareth, 37f.
Nazirite, 5
Non-resistance, 63
Nunc Dimittis, the, 21

Parables, 120
Paradise, 246
Passover, the, 220, 222f., 226f.
Peter's call, 44f.
Peter's confidence, 229
Peter's denial, 234f.
Pharisees, the, 127f., 168f., 259f.
Philip the Tetrarch, 27
Pilate, 27, 143, 237f.
Prayer, 120f., 182f.
Predictions of the Passion, 96, 103
Preface, 1
Proto-Luke, xxf.
Proverbs attributed to Jesus, 105
psychē, 97
Publicans, 29

'Q,' xif.
Quirinius, 17

Rabbinic teaching, 159, 262
Raising from the dead, 68
Reason for parables, the, 79f.
Repentance, 28
Resurrection, Jewish idea of, 210f.
Resurrection of Jesus, the, 256f.
Rewards, Jesus' teaching on, 166f., 189f.
Riches, Jesus' teaching on, 136, 168, 185f.

Sackcloth and ashes, 110
Sadducees, the, 210f., 262
Samaritans, the, 105f., 115f., 178f.
Sanhedrin, the, 236f.
Scribes, the, 51, 113f., 130, 214, 261
Sentius Saturninus, 14f.
Sermon on the Plain, the, 59f.
Shewbread, 54
Siloam, 144
Simeon, 20f.
Simon Zelotes, 58
Sin and Suffering, 48
Son of Man, the, 49f.
Source-Criticism, xf.
Suffering, the problem of, 143f.
Suffering Servant, the, 95
'Synoptic,' x
Tacitus, 238
'Take no thought,' 135
Temple treasury, the, 215
Tertullian, 15f.
Textual criticism, viiif.
Thomas, gospel of, 23
Tiberius, 26, 208
Toleration, 104f.
Transfiguration, the, 98f.
Tribute, 207f.
'We' passages in Acts, the, xviif.
Westcott and Hort, x
'Wisdom,' 74, 131
'Woe unto,' 62
Wonder stories, 89
Zacchaeus, 192f.
Zealots, the, 58, 170

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY
W. LEWIS, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

DATE DUE

FEB 27			
MAR 3			
MAR 22			
NOV 1			
NOV 15			
OCT 2 0			
MAY 02			
APR 29			
DEC 19			
MAY 05			

DEMCO 38-297

Duke University Libraries
D00663388Y

220.7 C178C v.40 38716
Div. S

DUKE-LSC
D00663388Y